THE RELEVANCE-ACCESSIBILITY MODEL OF ADVERTISING EFFECTIVENESS

By

WILLIAM EDWARD BAKER

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1991

Copyright 1991

by

William Edward Baker

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my supervisory committee for working with me on this dissertation. Most of all I would like to thank Rich Lutz for being my mentor and friend through this long, but very worthwhile ordeal that began almost five years ago. Rich has spent countless hours working on the RAM's conceptual foundation, formal theoretical structure and experimental design. He has spent an equal number of hours editing manuscripts. This project would not have been possible without his wisdom, insights and guidance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

ABSTRACT vi

CHAPTERS

1 THE RELEVANCE-ACCESSIBILITY MODEL OF ADVERTISING EFFECTIVENESS 1

Introduction 1
Axiom 1: Advertising Information Must be Accessible to be Effective 5
Axiom 2: Advertising Must be Relevant to be Effective 8
Proposition 1: Advertising Effectiveness Occurs at the Point of Brand Choice 10
Proposition 2: Consumers Use Three Levels of Information to Make Brand Choices 15
Proposition 3: Involvement Determines Consumers' Preferred Level of Information 21
Proposition 4: Involvement Determines the Level of Information Learned 31
Advertising Effectiveness 40
Summary 46

2 LITERATURE REVIEW 49

Introduction 49
Attitude-Behavior Consistency 50
The Impact of Consumer Elaboration and Involvement on Information Accessibility 68
Affect and Automaticity 95
Intervening Theoretical Constructs 120

3 THE FORMAL THEORETICAL STRUCTURE 139

Axioms 139
Principles 147
Experimental Hypotheses 158

4 METHOD 162

Experimental Rationale 162
Experimental Design 163
Experimental Procedure 167
Independent Variables 169
Primary Dependent Variable 178
Experimental Pretests 179

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 206

Manipulation Checks 206
Experimental Results 211
Demand Effects 223
Summary 225

6 GENERAL DISCUSSION 227

Theoretical Contribution 227
Empirical Contribution 230
Applied Contribution 232
Future Research 235

APPENDICES

A MESSAGE APPEAL COPY 240

B EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE 243

C PRETEST INSTRUCTIONS 272

D SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES 309

REFERENCES 315

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 338

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE RELEVANCE-ACCESSIBILITY MODEL OF ADVERTISING EFFECTIVENESS

By

William Edward Baker

August, 1991

Chairman: Richard J. Lutz
Major Department: Marketing

The Relevance-Accessibility Model (RAM) is a framework to study the issue of advertising effectiveness. Fundamentally, it proposes that advertising effects must be both accessible and relevant at the time of brand choice to be effective. Effect accessibility is a function of consumer behavior at the advertising exposure occasion (AEO). Effect relevance is a function of consumer behavior at the brand response occasion (BRO).

The RAM proposes that specific message information recalled at the brand response occasion, not brand attitudes formed at the advertising exposure, most typically mediates advertising effectiveness. The model identifies three levels of information that can mediate brand choice, affect, quality cues and relative performance information, and links them to three macro brand choice processes: indifference, satisficing and optimizing, respectively. At the AEO, advertising

message involvement (AMI) determines the level of information that consumers are most likely to efficiently encode in memory. At the BRO, brand response involvement (BRI) determines the level of information that consumers are most likely to seek to discriminate brand alternatives. The Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution states that advertising effectiveness is most likely to be maximized when message content, AMI and BRI correspond. When they do not correspond, breakdowns in advertising effect accessibility, relevance or both occur.

An experiment tested the model's fundamental assertions. A 3x3 between subjects design manipulated AMI and BRI. Three test advertisements were embedded in a radio show; each communicated one of the three levels of information. The primary dependent variable was brand choice (i.e., message appeal choice). Results confirmed the general thesis that advertising effectiveness is determined at both the AEO and the BRO; there were strong, significant effects of both AMI and BRI on message appeal choice. The Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution was also supported, each message appeal was dominant in its respective involvement correspondence cell.

CHAPTER 1
THE RELEVANCE-ACCESSIBILITY MODEL OF ADVERTISING EFFECTIVENESS

Introduction

A beer advertising executive kicks back in his chair. The new campaign is a winner. Sales for their premium beer are up. He knows why the campaign succeeded. It communicated the beer's superior quality. The creative director for the company's agency also knows why it worked. Men relate to the outdoorsy, rugged lifestyle portrayed in the campaign. They want to drink the beer because it makes a statement about "who they are." The marketing research director also knows why it worked. It increased top of mind awareness of the brand relative to its competitors. "In an undifferentiated product category," he says, "people choose the first beer that comes to mind." The academic consultant to the company also knows why it worked. It classically conditioned strong positive feelings to the brand. People are just naturally "drawn" to it when they see it in on the shelf. Any one of the reasons are viable. Perhaps each one of them influenced some people. But which reason influenced the most people in the brand's target market?

How can advertisers be confident that they have isolated the key message factor that made their campaign successful or unsuccessful? If they guess wrong, their next campaign could flop. As exemplified above, a typical beer advertisement may succeed for several reasons. Most beer advertisements tout

the quality of the beer, flaunt active engaging people having the best time of their lives drinking it, repeat the beer's brand name and display the bottle several times and feature popular music and striking visual effects. Obviously, it's important for advertisers to know the real rather than just a good reason why their advertisement worked or didn't work with their consumer target market. Then, ads can be designed to emphasize the persuasive elements of the advertising and omit the superfluous ones.

For decades, advertising researchers have chronicled the many ways advertising can influence consumer preferences for products and services. Most of these means of persuasion make intuitive sense and almost certainly would not surprise advertising professionals or consumers. For example, we have learned that advertising sometimes persuades simply by associating "good feelings" to brands by being funny, by having beautiful imagery, by weaving sensual moods, etc. (Silk & Vavra, 1974; Mitchell & Olson, 1981). We've also learned that advertising sometimes persuades by making people "think" about product benefits; for example, by highlighting a brand's unique benefits or by convincing consumers that one brand has a relative advantage over alternative brands on one or more delivered benefits (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961, Lutz & Swasy, 1977). And, we have learned that advertising can work by linking brands with quality "cues" such as an expert spokesperson, reputable manufacturer, or peer popularity (Chaiken, 1980, Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Eventually, the sum of this research will produce a complete "menu" of ways in which advertising messages can persuade consumers.

What is less obvious is when each of these ways advertising can work, <u>will</u> work. This latter issue is of primary importance to advertising practitioners. Cataloguing all the ways that advertising can work is only half the battle. Strategists also need to know when each of a series of potential strategies is likely

to be most effective. Ultimately, a list of rules is needed to select the optimal message strategy out of the entire menu of available strategies for any given situation. For example, the rules must determine when the goal of advertising should be to make people feel good, or when its goal need be to inform people why a brand is better than another brand by providing specific, comparative information.

The Relevance-Accessibility Model of Advertising Effectiveness (RAM) is a theory that confronts the issue of maximizing advertising message effectiveness. The RAM presumes that the primary purpose of advertising is to present information that will give a brand a "relative advantage" over competing brand alternatives at the time of brand choice. This relative advantage serves to motivate purchase behavior (See Baker & Lutz, 1987). The RAM establishes guidelines for picking the most effective advertising message strategy from a menu of strategic options. More specifically, since the ultimate measure of advertising effectiveness is brand choice, the RAM is a model concerned with predicting when a given message strategy is most and least likely to influence brand choice.

The purpose of this chapter is to present two major assumptions or axioms upon which the Relevance-Accessibility Model is built and four more specific propositions that facilitate the transformation of these assumptions into a theory of advertising effectiveness. The specific "rules" or principles that the Relevance-Accessibility Model offers to pick or predict the best message strategy in a given advertising scenario come from these propositions. This reader should not consider this framework to be the formal theoretical structure of the Relevance-Accessibility Model; this will be presented in Chapter 3.

The first of these axioms states that elements of the advertising message must be accessible at the time of brand choice to be effective. The key implication is that advertising effectiveness is not typically determined by brand attitude

formation at the advertising exposure occasion, but by consumer perceptions of accessible elements of the advertising message at the time of brand choice. The second axiom states that advertising information must be relevant to be effective. Breakdowns in advertising effectiveness often occur because advertising is communicating the wrong level of information.

Four propositions flesh out these two axioms. The first proposition states that advertising effectiveness is ultimately determined at the point of brand choice. Attempts to study advertising effectiveness at or near the time of advertising exposure are likely to greatly overstate effectiveness. The second proposition states that consumers use three levels of information to make brand purchase decisions. These levels are relative performance information, quality cues and pure affect (feelings). The third proposition states that brand response involvement determines the level of information that consumers prefer to use to make their brand choice. When brand response involvement is low, consumers react to the affect evoking qualities of brands. When involvement is moderate, consumers tend to seek quality cues to reassure themselves they are buying a "good" brand. When involvement is high, consumers are motivated to optimize their brand choice by using specific brand information that provides direct evidence of a brand's relative quality. Proposition four states that advertising message involvement predicts the level of information that consumers are most likely to efficiently encode at the advertising exposure occasion. Low involvement is associated with the automatic encoding of affect; moderate involvement is linked to the encoding of absolute quality cues and high involvement is characterized by the processing of detailed relative performance information.

The major implication to draw from these propositions is that advertising effectiveness is most likely to be successful when advertising messages communicate at the level of information consumers are most likely to use to

discriminate brands at the purchase occasion. Given this, advertising effectiveness will be optimized when consumer advertising message involvement corresponds to brand response involvement. Only then can advertising exposure typically lead to the efficient encoding of the level of information that consumers are motivated to use to make their brand choice. Unfortunately, there are many situations when advertising message involvement is likely to be lower than brand response involvement. When this occurs, breakdowns in advertising effectiveness are likely to occur.

Axiom 1:
Advertising Information Must be Accessible to be Effective

The RAM assumes that advertising can be effective only when the impressions it creates in a consumer's memory are retrieved (accessed) from memory when brand evaluations are made. These impressions may be visual, verbal or emotional.

The idea that a persuasive communication's effect on evaluation is dependent on the memorability of elements of that communication, but not necessarily an attitude or judgement of that communication made at the time of exposure, is not new (Tversky & Kahneman,1973; Lichtenstein & Srull, 1983; Feldman & Lynch, 1988). However, a great deal of current advertising research assumes, sometimes implicitly, that advertising works by influencing brand attitudes or judgements at the time of advertising exposure, which in turn influence choice at a later time. The RAM views brand attitudes, judgments or preferences formed at the time of advertising exposure as potential mediators of brand choice but no more or less likely to actually mediate brand choice than memory of the actual or

mentally transformed advertising message content (e.g., benefit claims, spokespeople endorsements, emotion evoking music and visuals, etc.).

This assumption is simple, but as the brief discussion that follows illustrates, predicting the accessibility of advertising information is a very complex issue; there are a multitude of factors to consider.

When a consumer is exposed to advertising, that advertising leaves an impression in memory. Depending on the level of attention a consumer directs at an advertisement, the memory impression it leaves may be very weak and difficult to access at a later time, or it may be very strong and simple to access (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984). The direction of focus of a consumer's attention influences the elements of the advertising that are most likely to be retrievable. For example, all things equal, if a consumer focuses on the executional aspects of an advertisement such as background scenery or an actor, then that is what is most likely to be remembered. If, on the other hand, the consumer focuses on the message, then that is what is most likely to be remembered.

The impressions left in memory may bear little resemblance to the actual content of advertising. Consumers may misunderstand the contents of a message (See Jacoby, 1973). For example, they may believe a message claimed that a pain reliever lasts six hours, when in fact the message claimed twelve hours. They also may mentally "summarize" a message. For example, while viewing television commercials, consumers may make make mental abstractions such as, "my detergent doesn't get my clothes this white," "Honda really handles the curves" or "this ad is stupid." These mental summaries and evaluative reactions are more likely to leave a highly accessible impression than the literal elements of the advertising (Alba & Hasher, 1983; Carlston, 1980; Wright, 1980).

Advertising information that consumer perceive to be meaningful is more likely to be heavily attended than information that is not so perceived

(Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983). For example, advertising that conveys brand benefits that are important to consumers, depicts brand usage situations that make sense to consumers and portrays lifestyles and living situations with which consumers can relate, is more likely to be perceived as meaningful. Since meaningful information is attended and elaborated more than non-meaningful information, it is more likely to be accessible at a later time.

There are qualities to information that make it intrinsically more or less accessible. A picture may not always be worth a thousand words, but visual information is typically easier to encode and retrieve from memory than verbal information (See Anderson & Bower, 1980). Unique, distinctive verbal expressions are easier to remember than common expressions (See Berlyne, 1970). Highly arousing, mood-evoking information, something frightening, erotic, or beautiful, is inherently more memorable than flat, non-stimulating information (See Kroeber-Riel, 1979).

"Environmental" factors also exert a major influence on the accessibility of advertising information. Accessibility increases with repetition. If repeated enough, some types of information can be retrieved automatically without effort when a person sees a brand name or package (Schiffrin & Schneider, 1977; Bargh, 1984). Accessibility increases in the presence of memory cues (Bettman & Sujan, 1987). A brand name, a brand package and scenes or characters from an advertisement can all cue the retrieval of other advertising information. Accessibility decreases as the delay between advertising exposure and brand evaluation increases (See Wyer & Srull, 1986). Some qualitative types of information decay in memory at a faster rate than other information (Moore & Hutchinson, 1985; Baker, 1985).

Due to the many motivational (i.e., desire to pay attention to advertising), structural (e.g., advertising copy and execution elements) and environmental

(e.g, repetition and delay) factors that influence the accessibility of advertising information, it is difficult at best for any theory to reliably predict one individual's ability to access specific elements of a given advertisement. This is not the intent of the RAM. The intent of the RAM is to predict the relative accessibility of the information inherent in one type of advertising strategy versus other types of advertising strategies in a given situation across a large number of individuals. The model as presented in this paper will emphasize motivational antecedents.

Axiom 2:
Advertising Information Must be Relevant to be Effective

The RAM further assumes that accessed advertising information must explicitly or implicitly be perceived by the consumer to be relevant at the time of brand choice if it is to have a direct effect on brand choice. Explicit recognition of relevance refers to those situations when consumers consciously, deliberately seek out specific information because they believe it to be a more reliable indicator of quality than other information. Information that is explicitly judged to be irrelevant will be discounted in favor of other more relevant information. Implicit recognition of relevance refers to the more subtle influences of information that is not sought out, but that can automatically drive behavior unless it is deliberately discounted, influences such as the effects of familiarity (Baker et al., 1986) and classical conditioning (Gorn, 1983).

This assumption of relevance is completely consistent with the focus of applied marketing research and many academic models of persuasion and decision-making. It is standard marketing research practice to identify the product benefits that are most and least important to consumers when they are

making purchase decisions. Techniques to identify the most relevant benefits in a product category range from standard focus group and survey research methodologies to more sophisticated technologies like conjoint analysis and multi-dimensional scaling. Many academic models of persuasion and decision-making also act on the assumption that consumer choice is a function of perceived relative brand performance on one or more product benefits (Lutz, 1975; Lynch, Marmorstein & Weigold, 1988).

One commonality among most applied and academic models of decision-making is that they tend to look at relevance from the perspective of relative brand performance across a series of explicit product benefits or attributes. Using these approaches, for example, cars may be evaluated on the basis of styling, speed, comfort and depreciation. Microwaves may be evaluated on the basis of cooking speed, price and durability.

The purpose of the RAM is <u>not</u> to predict which of a set of specific performance or value features are most important, most relevant to consumers. The RAM examines relevance from a more general perspective. Its purpose is to predict whether specific relative performance information is likely to be used at all to make brand choices. Like the Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) and the Percentage Contribution Model (Batra & Ray, 1985), for example, the RAM proposes that consumers base brand choices on different qualitative categories of information, each of which is perceived to be most relevant in different situations.

The RAM presumes that the perceived relevance of various types of information is determined primarily by motivational factors. However, the model also recognizes that there are a number of factors that may make it difficult or impossible for consumers to use the type of information that they may prefer to use in a situation. There are environmental factors such as the <u>availability</u> of

the preferred information either externally (e.g., in a store) or internally (e.g., in memory), experienced based factors such as expertise (e.g., the ability to discriminate brands using the desired information) and opportunity based factors such as time (e.g., it may take too much time to choose a brand using the information a consumer would prefer to use) (See Alba & Hutchinson, 1987). A focus of this paper will be on proposing how consumer motivation at the time of brand choice influences perceived informational relevance and how this relates to the issue of maximizing advertising effectiveness.

The bulk of the remaining portion of this paper will be devoted to presenting four major propositions of the RAM. The final part of the paper will outline the implications of these propositions for maximizing advertising effectiveness.

Proposition 1:
Advertising Effectiveness Occurs at the Point of Brand Choice

The RAM presumes that brand purchase decisions typically are not made when people are watching, reading or listening to advertisements. Given this, the effectiveness of an advertising message strategy must be judged at the brand response occasion (i.e., the point of brand choice), not the advertising exposure occasion (i.e., the point of advertising exposure). Usually, these two occasions are separated by time and space. Typically, advertising message exposure occurs in the home or car, while brand choice decisions occur at the point of purchase, usually a store.

Two implications follow directly. First, any persuasive effects of advertising at the advertising exposure occasion may no longer be accessible at the brand response occasion. Second, advertising information that is perceived as relevant

at the advertising exposure occasion may not be so perceived at the brand response occasion.

Memory Decay

Any theory of advertising effectiveness that does not consider the effects of the decay of advertising information in memory is likely to overstate the impact of advertising because it exaggerates the memorability of advertising. Consumers are exposed to hundreds of advertisements every day. Their ability to remember advertising information over time is limited. As the time between advertising message exposure and brand choice increases, the ability to remember advertising information deteriorates rapidly (Ward & Sawyer, 1981).

Similarly, any theory of advertising effectiveness that does not consider the memorability of advertising relative to other sources of information at the brand response occasion is likely to overstate the impact of advertising effects on brand choice at the brand response occasion. Advertising does not operate in a vacuum. Consumers can base their brand choice decisions on many sources of information other than advertising such as prior brand usage experiences, package information and point of purchase display information. Advertising must compete with these other sources of information at the brand response occasion. If advertising effectiveness is judged at the time of advertising exposure, then it is likely to be exaggerated because it is being given a contrived advantage over these other sources of information.

Since consumers often make purchase decisions quickly with little deliberate mental effort (Krugman, 1965, Ray, 1973; Hoyer, 1984), in many choice situations easy to remember, "top of mind" information is more likely to be used to make a brand choice than less accessible, more difficult to retrieve information, even if this more difficult to retrieve information is of equal or greater relevance

(Hoch, 1984; Wyer & Srull, 1986; Feldman & Lynch, 1988). As the time between the advertising exposure occasion and the brand response occasion increases, the amount of effort it takes to remember and use advertising information relative to other sources of information increases (See Anderson, 1983). So, even if advertising information is not forgotten, if it takes considerable effort to remember it, other more readily accessible information is likely to take its place at the brand response occasion.

Consider an example. Assume that a shampoo advertisement imparts a relative advantage for the shampoo over its competitors, perhaps by a discussion of a critical control ingredient, a professional endorsement of the product or other aspects of the advertisement. If choice took place at that moment, the consumers it persuaded would choose it.

However, over time, the memory of the commercial will fade considerably. After two weeks, many of the consumers originally persuaded may no longer associate any claims in the advertisement to the brand. In this scenario, the advertisement can no longer influence choice unless the consumers made a mental note at the time of advertising exposure to buy the brand, and remembered it (Lingle et al., 1979; Carlston, 1980). Some of the consumers may be able to remember the message with considerable effort, but may not be willing to make that effort at the store. In this case, even if the consumers intend to choose a brand that gives extra control, or that is endorsed by professionals, the advertisement is unlikely to influence choice because other information that is more easily accessed such as package information or usage experience memories will be used.

Changes in Informational Relevance

The "pool" of easily accessible information from which to draw to make brand choice decisions is likely to change significantly from the advertising exposure occasion to the brand response occasion because the two environments are very different. At the advertising exposure occasion for a given brand, advertising information for this brand is likely to dominate the "pool" of easily accessible information because it is an environment where other sources of information are at an extreme disadvantage. There are no packages or point of purchase displays that can provide information about competing brands and remind people of prior usage experiences. Advertising information for competing brands is less accessible because advertisements for these brands were not just seen, read or heard.

Given this, advertising information is more likely to be perceived to be relevant at the advertising exposure occasion than at the brand response occasion. There is less information with which it must compete. There is less information that can render the advertising information irrelevant to the choice decision for consumers. Any theory of advertising effectiveness that does not consider the potential that the perceived relevance of advertising information may be artificially inflated at the advertising exposure occasion because other potentially more relevant information to the consumer is absent or less accessible, is likely to overstate the impact of advertising messages on brand choice.

Consider the shampoo advertisement example again. At the advertising exposure occasion, women may report very high purchase intentions for the shampoo because the information on the critical control ingredient or the professional endorser seem relevant and, hence, motivates them to want the brand. At the brand response occasion, however, new information may make this information less relevant and, hence, no longer motivating. They may learn that

the shampoo costs twice as much as other brands or has a scent they strongly dislike. They may notice other shampoos that they know through experience provide excellent control, or recall that other brands have control ingredients just as effective as the other advertised brand; or out of the biased context of the advertising exposure occasion, they may remember an advertisement for another brand that is endorsed by someone whose opinion they respect more than the endorser for the other advertisement.

Summary

The RAM proposes that any theory whose purpose it is to predict the effectiveness of advertising on choice behavior must evaluate advertising effectiveness in the context of the brand response occasion, not the advertising exposure occasion. Both the accessibility and the relevance of advertising information are likely to be overstated in the context of the advertising exposure occasion, which means the impact of advertising on brand choice decisions is likely to be overstated. Depending on the evaluation of the advertising message, the impact may be overstated positively (i.e., advertising motivates acceptance of the brand) or negatively (i.e., advertising motivates rejection of the brand).

The accessibility of advertising information is biased in the context of the advertising exposure occasion because its natural tendency to decay in memory between the time of advertising exposure and brand choice is not considered. Also, through the process of output interference, the high accessibility of brand advertising information at the advertising exposure occasion inhibits the ability of consumers to retrieve other information (Alba & Chattopadhyay, 1985).

The relevance of advertising information is overstated in the context of the advertising exposure occasion because other potentially more relevant sources of

information that are typically present or highly accessible at the time of brand choice are not so at the advertising exposure occasion.

Proposition 2:
Consumers Use Three Levels of Information to Make Brand Choices

The RAM proposes that advertising influences brand choice through the effects of three general levels of information: Pure affect (feelings), brand quality cues, and relative brand performance information.

Relative brand performance information is the most detailed, most direct information that is available about a brand. It provides explicit, specific "apples to apples" comparisons among competing brands to identify the best of a set of brands. For example, a consumer may decide to compare cars on the basis of performance features such as gas mileage and acceleration, or on the basis of image features such as styling and color before making a purchase decision.

Much of the persuasion research in the 1960's (See Fishbein, 1967) and the 1970's (See Lutz & Swasy, 1977) operated on the assumption that consumers explicitly compare brand alternatives across multiple relevant utilitarian and/or hedonic benefits. Brand choice was expected to be the outcome of a series of complex trade-offs among brand alternatives. The brand with the greatest relative advantage across all product benefits was expected to be chosen. Other approaches assumed that consumers make explicit comparisons between brand alternatives, but only across the most important benefit they provide, or only until a brand emerged as a clear winner on one key benefit (See Bettman, 1979). The common thread through many of these popular models of persuasion and advertising response is they viewed the consumer as a "rational man," as an information processing machine similar to a computer. The input to this

information processing machine was assumed to be specific performance information that allows direct comparisons to be made across brands.

Brand quality cues provide descriptive, but indirect information that can be used to make inferences about a brand's quality, but they contain no definitive evidence of a brand's performance relative to other brands. For example, rather than take the time and expend the effort to compare cars on specific features, an individual may take a short-cut and buy a car because it's a top seller, produced by a manufacturer that stands for quality or status or luxury, or simply because it possesses one or more attributes that are symbolic of quality (e.g., the door "thuds" when slammed, front wheel drive, fuel injected engine). Although the reliability of many quality cues may be unshakeable, one might say they provide no more than "circumstantial evidence" of relative quality and performance.

Almost everybody can personally relate to making brand selections using quality cues rather than more specific performance information. The specific persuasive effects of commonly used quality cues such as brand name prestige (Wheatley, Walton & Chiu, 1982), price (Monroe, 1973)), expert endorsement (Sternthal, Dholakia, 1978 & Leavitt, 1978) and the sheer number of brand benefits (Alba, 1987) are intuitively obvious and have been demonstrated empirically. Theoretical models predict their usage when consumers do not have the motivation, ability or opportunity to use more specific information (Chaiken, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).

Pure affect refers to "free-floating" feelings and emotional responses that are consciously unlinked to any specific brand attributes, benefits, past promotional (e.g., advertising) or usage experiences, at least at the time of brand choice. Such affect provides no real evidence of either absolute or relative product quality, but consumers may interpret it as such. When individuals make decisions based on

pure affect, they are reacting solely to a feeling, not on the information that led to that feeling.

Positive feelings intrinsically motivate approach behavior, negative feelings motivate avoidance behavior (Zajonc, 1980; Skinner, 1974). These naturally reinforcing properties of affect can influence brand choice. The sources of accessed affect may be brand name familiarity (Harrison, 1977), the classical conditioning of affect evoking stimuli like music or beautiful visuals to a brand through advertising (Gorn, 1983), the affective residue from past usage experiences or a combination of these and other affective experiences that have come to be associated to a brand over time (Kiselius & Sternthal, 1984).

In the economists' world of the "rational man" making decisions with perfect information, consumers would always use relative performance information to make their brand choices because it is the most reliable, most direct brand information available. Most marketing academics and practitioners agree that this does not happen. In fact, everybody but economists agree that this does not happen. Even a lot of economists agree that this does not happen.

It is certainly not "irrational" for consumers to make purchase decisions with less than perfect information. We live in an era where brands competing in many product categories are so equal that few, if any, substantive differences exist between them. When product innovations do occur, they are copied quickly. In such product categories many consumers believe that it is a waste of their time to compare brands on the basis of specific performance features. When consumers perceive they do not need specific information to make a brand choice, the motivation to take the time and energy to meticulously compare brand alternatives is low (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983; Robertson, 1976).

Another implication of the similarity among brand offerings is that consumers may attempt but fail to find differences among brand alternatives on

specific features. For example, consumers may compare two sports cars across several performance features and conclude they are equal. When this happens, they may have no recourse but to use other types of information such as brand quality cues or simple affective reactions to discriminate brands. In the end, one sports car may be chosen over the other because it it is from a more prestigious manufacturer (i.e., a brand quality cue), or perhaps more simply because, for some reason unknown to the consumer at the time of choice, he/she is "drawn" to one car over the other (i.e., a purely affective response).

In product classes where real differences do exist, the differences are sometimes difficult to observe. Some consumers do not have the ability to compare brands on specific information, others have the ability but do not have the time to make these comparisons. Many consumers would like to compare automobiles on the basis of specific engine performance features, but do not have the ability. If grocery shoppers took the time to specifically compare every brand alternative on the shelf before making every purchase, they would never get out of the store. In both cases, circumstances force them to make decisions on the basis of other types of information.

An Extended Example

The potential influence of all three levels of information on brand choice can be illustrated through the following example. Imagine the following TV commercial for a brand of shampoo. A young, alluring woman brushes her long beautiful hair in a luxurious penthouse suite filled with classical music. The woman explains that her shampoo has made her hair thick and manageable. A graphic demonstrates that the shampoo has more of a critical control ingredient than other shampoos. An announcer states that the shampoo is preferred by

professional hairdressers three to one over the leading shampoo. As the commercial ends, a handsome young gentleman arrives at the penthouse.

All three types of information are included in this commercial. The commercial may be persuasive for many different reasons. Some motivated viewers may form specific relative performance beliefs about the shampoo and use them at the point of purchase to choose the brand. For example, the graphics display may persuade them that the shampoo provides more control than other brands, or the theme of the commercial may persuade them that using this shampoo will improve their social life more than other shampoos.

Other viewers may be persuaded on the basis of the brand quality cues it communicates. One brand quality cue is the credibility of the woman. Viewers may believe that a beautiful woman with beautiful hair is a credible source whose recommendations should be considered. Another brand quality cue is the fact that 75% of surveyed professional hairdressers prefer the shampoo. Many viewers may find this to be reassuring evidence that the shampoo is of high quality.

Finally, some viewers may not remember any specific information from the commercial, but may be persuaded by the affective "residue" generated by the beauty, atmosphere and music in the commercial. The beautiful woman, luxurious penthouse, sensuous music, and handsome man may have combined to associate a very strong, positive feeling to the brand that influences brand choice when they see the brand on the shelf in the supermarket.

A Brand Loyalty Caveat

The RAM operates under the assumption that consumers do not have strongly formed preferences for a brand at the time of choice. In these cases, prior preferences are likely to override the usage of raw information (i.e., relative performance beliefs, quality cues and affect) and be the primary determinant of

purchase behavior. Situations where prior preferences are expected to dominate brand choice are not expected to be common for the following reasons. First, consumer durables (e.g., automobiles, major appliances) are modified frequently, but purchased infrequently. Due to the changes in brand characteristics and the potential presence of new brands, prior preferences become "obsolete" (Biehal & Chakravarti, 1986). Second, there are so few differences between many consumer nondurables (e.g., packaged foods, household cleaners, etc.) that there is little or no basis on which to form strong preferences (See Lastovicka & Bonfield, 1982). The ability of couponing, rebates, and other discounting strategies to constantly "switch" consumers from brand to brand in these product categories indicates the absence of strong performance-based preferences.

Summary

A central proposition of the RAM is that consumers can discriminate brands by using three types of information, relative performance information, quality cues and pure affect.

The key implication of this proposition is that advertising strategists need to know which type of information their consumer target market is most likely to use when making purchase decisions in a given product category. In any given product category, advertising strategists need to know if their target is most likely to deliberately compare brand alternatives across performance dimensions, employ brand quality cues or rely on simple affective reactions to base their brand choice decision.

The information type that is most likely to be used by the targeted consumers for a given brand in a given product category needs to be emphasized in advertising messages for that product category. If most targeted consumers for a given brand of shampoo buy shampoos on the basis of simple affective reactions,

then the goal of advertising should be to associate positive feelings to the brand. Communicating relative performance information is a waste of advertising copy if that type of information is not expected to be used by consumers at the point of purchase and is only likely to inhibit advertising effectiveness. Conversely, if targeted consumers buy shampoos on the basis of relative performance information, then the commercial should stress information capable of persuading consumers that the brand is superior on one or performance dimensions and de-emphasize elements of the ad that generate only positive feelings.

Proposition 3:
Involvement Determines Consumers' Preferred Level of Information

Brand Response Involvement

Simply put, involvement refers to the intensity of mental effort (Cohen, 1982). Brand Response Involvement is the degree of mental effort expended by the consumer while making a brand choice. When brand response involvement (BRI) is high, consumers are motivated to think intently about their brand choice; they are motivated to explicitly search for information and compare brand alternatives. At the other extreme, when BRI is very low, consumers are not motivated to think about their brand choice; they have little desire to either seek information or compare brand alternatives.

Major antecedents of brand response involvement are two dimensions of perceived product risk: perceived product differentiation and the perceived consequences of a nonoptimal brand choice decision (Robertson, 1976; Kapferer & Laurent, 1985). Perceived product differentiation refers to the degree consumers believe there are performance differences between the brand alternatives in a

product category. As perceived product differentiation increases, the probability of making a "nonoptimal" brand choice increases. For this reason, increased differentiation is expected to lead to increased brand response involvement. For example, if a consumer believes there are performance differences between the brands of shampoo on a supermarket shelf, he or she is more likely to spend time seeking information and considering the brand alternatives than if he or she believes that all shampoos are the same.

The probability that a "nonoptimal" brand choice has negative consequences is also expected to influence brand response involvement. Negative consequences may be economic, perhaps the loss of thousands of dollars that result from choosing the wrong automobile. They may be social, perhaps the peer ridicule that results from buying the wrong style of clothing. Or, they may be utilitarian, perhaps from buying a microwave that is missing a useful feature such as automatic cooking programs.

The highest level of brand response involvement is only expected when consumers perceive both major product differentiation and serious consequences of a nonoptimal brand choice. Perceived high product differentiation does not necessarily imply that serious negative consequences will result from a nonoptimal brand choice. Consumers may perceive that many differences exits between brand alternatives and, as a result, may believe there is a high probability of making a nonoptimal brand choice. They may also believe, however, that there are no serious consequences of making a nonoptimal choice, no serious economic, social or utilitarian injury. For example, some consumers may perceive there are many differences between shampoos' color, smell, control, price, etc., but they may also believe that a less than ideal choice will have little consequence because even the worst considered shampoo will perform adequately. In this case, perceived

high product differentiation is not expected to lead to the highest level of brand response involvement.

Also, the perception that there are serious negative consequences associated with a non-optimal brand choice does not necessarily imply high perceived product differentiation. Some product categories trigger perceptions of risk because of their social, utilitarian and/or economic importance. However, brands within these product categories may not be significantly differentiated. Choosing the wrong pain reliever, for example, may have serious utilitarian consequences, but people are not likely to meticulously choose a pain reliever unless they also believe there are real performance differences between the alternatives in their consideration set.

BRI Influences How People Make Brand Choice Decisions.

Brand response involvement is a cornerstone of the RAM because it is presumed that as brand response involvement changes, different levels of information are sought by consumers at the brand response occasion, and others are avoided or ignored. The RAM proposes that brand response involvement is the primary determinant of the level of information that consumers seek to make brand choices. What follows is a discussion of three levels of brand response involvement and how the RAM predicts they correspond to the three levels of information described in Proposition Two.

High BRI leads to "optimization." The highest level of brand response involvement is most likely to occur when consumers perceive both high product differentiation and high product risk. That is, they believe there are major differences between brand alternatives and they believe an nonoptimal brand choice will have serious negative consequences. This situation motivates them to

want to optimize their brand choice; they want to make the best decision possible and are willing to expend the mental effort required to make the best choice.

Optimization is characterized by consumers choosing what they believe to be the best of a considered set of brands. Assuming consumers have the ability and opportunity to explicitly compare brand alternatives, it makes sense that if consumers wish to optimize their brand choice they will seek the most specific information available information that permits direct "apples to apples" comparisons between brand alternatives. When consumers are highly involved in the purchase decision, the RAM presumes they will seek the highest level of information, relative performance information, to make their brand choice. Optimizing consumers are willing to spend the time and effort to read package information, recall brand information from memory, talk to salespeople, read Consumer Reports, etc.

Highly differentiated product categories with considerable economic, social and utilitarian risk to many consumers are likely to include automobiles, homes, durable appliances and clothing. Purchase decisions made to support hobby (coins, stamps, etc.) and sporting interests (skiing, tennis, golf, etc.) are also likely to be made in a state of high BRI.

Within a given product category, consumers may be motivated to optimize for different reasons. Referring to the shampoo example, some consumers may be highly involved because they want to buy the shampoo with the best control, others may want the shampoo that is least likely to sting their eyes, others may want the best-smelling shampoo. Whatever the cause, a person that is optimizing his/her shampoo brand choice will explicitly compare shampoo alternatives on the specific performance dimensions that he or she believes to be important.

Much of the consumer persuasion and decision-making literature in the 1960's and 1970's explicitly or implicitly assumed that consumers optimize purchase decisions. The plethora of multi-attribute expectancy value models experimented with during this period cast consumers as sophisticated decision makers calculating complex trade-offs across brand alternatives on several utilitarian and/or social attributes (Ryan & Bonfield, 1980; Toy, 1982). These approaches lost popularity as "all purpose" models of decision-making as the concept of involvement driven decision strategies grew in popularity (Ray et al., 1973) and because empirical tests have demonstrated that much simpler predictors of behavior often perform as well as compensatory models (Kraft, Granbois & Summers, 1973).

However, advertising research in consumer involvement has found that consumers do tend to use more specific performance or product related advertising message information when consumer involvement is high. Such research supports the idea that consumers do not always optimize, but they are most likely to attempt to optimize when they are in a state of high involvement. That is, consumers are most likely to evaluate brands on the basis of specific product related information when consumer involvement is high (See Ray et al., 1973; Robertson, 1976; Wright, 1980; MacKenzie, Lutz, & Belch, 1986).

Moderate BRI leads to "satisficing." When consumers perceive significant product differentiation, but little product risk, or perceive significant product risk, but little product differentiation, brand response involvement is likely to be moderate.

In the first case, consumers perceive a high probability, but no serious negative consequences of an nonoptimal brand choice. For example, a man may believe that microwaves vary in how quickly they cook food, but he may also believe they all cook food fast enough for his purposes. Or, a woman may believe that

some conditioners leave hair more manageable than others, but she may also believe the three or four brands in her consideration set all leave her hair sufficiently manageable. Assuming that the man is buying a microwave primarily to cook food fast and the woman is buying conditioner primarily to leave her hair manageable, there is no real reason for the man or the woman to optimize their brand choices. Both do not perceive any serious consequences of an nonoptimal purchase. As a result, the marginal effort required to optimize is not worth the marginal gain in product performance.

In the second case, consumers perceive serious consequences of a wrong choice, but little chance that a wrong chance will be made. For example, the purchase of a sports car has very high social risk to a young man that wants to improve his image among his peers. However, the three cars that remain in his consideration may all be very popular among his peers. Or, a woman buying a mink coat perceives serious economic consequences if she buys the "wrong" mink coat simply because they cost thousands of dollars. However, the three coats she has to choose from all cost about the same. Assuming that in both examples there are no other major perceived differences across the alternatives on risky dimensions, there is no reason for the man or the woman to optimize their brand choice. Again, the marginal effort required to optimize is not worth the marginal gain in performance.

When consumers believe there is no benefit to be gained from putting extreme mental energy into their purchase decision, BRI is likely to be moderate and optimization is not likely to occur. However, due to the high perceived risk or high perceived differentiation associated with the purchase, consumers need to feel comfortable that they are making a satisfactory brand choice. In this scenario consumers are expected to seek information to reassure themselves that they are making a good selection.

When BRI is moderate, the RAM presumes that people make satisficing brand decisions. Satisficing is characterized by consumers selecting the first acceptable brand, not necessarily the best of a considered set of brands. The RAM expects that people will typically use quality cues to select a brand when they are satisficing. Quality cues include a prior satisfactory usage experience, a credible spokesperson's endorsement, a friend's recommendation, the knowledge that a brand is a top seller or the professional image generated by high quality advertising. The knowledge that a brand possesses a key desired ingredient (e.g., aceteminophen, no salt, no sugar), or feature (e.g., automatic cooking programs, self-cleaning, permanent press, etc.), or that a brand is linked to a particular lifestyle (e.g., BMWs and "yuppies") or usage situation (e.g., Michelob and "the night") can also be quality cues. Whatever the quality cue, it must provide quick reassurance or reinforcement that the brand is good, that the brand is a satisfactory choice.

Different individuals are likely to use different quality cues to determine acceptability. In the case of shampoo, some consumers may buy a brand name that they trust, others may take the advice of a spokesperson, others may buy the most expensive brand and others may take the first brand they see that has a special ingredient or performance claim they desire.

Whatever the case, a satisficing brand decision typically takes significantly less time and effort to make than an optimizing brand decision, primarily because multiple brands are not explicitly compared across one or more performance features. Consumers are not motivated to thoroughly search through their memory or the purchase environment to find quality cues. They are "cognitive misers" and do not want to expend much mental effort to make their choice (Wyer & Srull, 1986). Consumers are likely to choose the first acceptable brand that comes to mind. This means that brands linked with easy to remember quality

cues are more likely to be chosen than brands whose quality cues are less accessible. When a consumer target market is expected to be satisficing, then, marketers must not only associate persuasive quality cues to their brand, they must make their quality cues more memorable than other brands' quality cues (See Wright & Rip, 1980; Hoch, 1984).

The link between the use of quality cue type information and lower levels of involvement is well established in both the advertising and social psychology literature. Experiments involving the Elaboration Likelihood Model and similar approaches have repeatedly shown that people less involved with an issue will tend to use peripheral cues such as the credibility of a spokesperson to evaluate an issue rather than specific message arguments (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, Chaiken, 1980). Other research has shown that consumers less involved with advertising tend to evaluate products on the basis of the appeal of the advertising execution rather than the product related message arguments (MacKenzie & Lutz, 1986; Baker, 1985).

Low BRI leads to "indifference." When BRI is very low, buyers perceive little or no product differentiation and little or no product risk. There is a low perceived probability of a "wrong" brand choice and trivial consequences if a wrong brand choice is made.

If there are no serious perceived economic, social or utilitarian risks in a product category and no perceived performance differences between brand alternatives in the product category, there is little reason for a consumer to expend any significant deliberate mental effort when making the brand choice. It's as if there are no real choices, no real alternatives from which to choose.

In this situation consumers are expected to be "indifferent." Indifferent purchase decisions are characterized by consumers selecting the first brand that

comes to mind. If there are multiple salient brand alternatives as in a supermarket shopping situation, indifference purchase decisions are characterized by consumers selecting the brand in the set with which they feel most comfortable. Indifferent decisions are expected to typically be driven by simple affective reactions towards brands that come to mind effortlessly at the time of brand choice.

For example, if a woman believes there are no differences among shampoos and no serious negative consequences associated with the choice of a "nonoptimal" brand of shampoo, then her purchase choice is likely to be influenced by simple affective reactions. Few, if any, deliberate brand comparisons or evaluation of quality cues accompany the decision process. While scanning a shelf of brand alternatives, she is likely to pick the shampoo that makes her feel most comfortable, the shampoo that evokes the most positive emotional reaction. These feelings may be created by the look of the package, by the familiarity of the brand name or by images that advertising has associated to the brand. She doesn't deliberately bring these feelings to mind, they automatically come to mind when she sees the brand.

When BRI is very low, decisions are made as quickly as possible. As a result, factors like shelf position, POP displays and package designs are predicted to have their strongest influence on purchase.

The RAM predicts that the free-floating affect that drives purchase decisions when involvement is very low can result from effects of affective classical conditioning (Gorn, 1983) and the exposure effect (Zajonc, 1980). Other research predicts that these types of effects are most likely to influence brand choice when consumer involvement in the purchase process is at its lowest level (Nord & Peter, 1980; Krober-Riehl, 1979, 1984; Obermiller, 1985).

Summary

Three types of purchase behavior have been identified and linked to brand response involvement: optimizing, satisficing and indifference. Each type of purchase behavior corresponds to a different decision-making process. Each decision-making process is associated with a different level of information: relative performance information, quality cues and affective reactions.

The advertising implications are straightforward. For any given product category, strategists need to identify the expected level of BRI of their consumer target market and produce advertising that communicates that level of information. When consumers optimize, present relative performance information about key product benefits. When consumers satisfice, present memorable, credible quality cues. When consumers are indifferent, build package and brand awareness and link positive feelings to the brand.

In the case of shampoo, if consumers are expected to optimize, then an advertisement presenting specific performance information that allows direct comparisons with other brands has the best chance of directly influencing brand choice. If consumers are satisficing, then an advertisement that uses a credible quality cue such as a famous model is most likely to be effective. If consumers are making "indifferent" decisions, then an advertisement that builds brand name familiarity and associates good feelings to the brand is most likely to be effective.If advertising is produced that is not communicating the "correct" level of information, then the RAM predicts that the impact of advertising at the point of purchase will suffer. If shampoo purchasers are optimizing at the point of brand choice and advertising presents simple quality cue type information, or if shampoo purchasers are operating indifferently and advertising presents relative performance information, then advertising is less likely to be effective because the advertising is communicating an inappropriate level of information; it is

communicating information that is not likely to be used at the time purchase decisions are made.

Proposition 4:
Involvement Determines the Level of Information Learned

Advertising Message Involvement

Advertising messages that communicate the "correct" level of information, the level of information consumers are expected to use at the brand response occasion, are not necessarily effective. Simply because an advertisement contains relative performance information, for example, does not mean that a consumer exposed to the advertisement will remember that information or the implications of that information at the time of brand purchase.

One reason a consumer may not remember the relative performance information in an advertising message is because the message may not have been "processed" in a manner that could lead to the efficient "storage" of the relative performance information in memory. For example, simply because an automobile commercial contains the results of a braking test among three cars does not mean that those results will be remembered by a consumer exposed to the advertisement. The consumer may not have paid sufficient attention to the relative performance information to store it in memory in a manner that would make it readily "accessible" when he or she is in the process of purchasing a car. Generally, consumers must mentally rehearse and perhaps simplify complex information in order to remember its meaning at a later time (See Alba & Hutchinson, 1987).

The RAM predicts that consumer motivation to attend, comprehend and integrate advertising message information into memory at the time of advertising exposure is a primary determinant of the level of information that

consumers will "take away" from the advertisement and be likely to remember at the time brand decisions are made (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984).

Advertising message involvement (AMI) refers to consumer motivation to attend, comprehend and integrate advertising message information into memory at the time of advertising exposure. As advertising message involvement increases, the cognitive effort expended by the consumer to process the contents of an advertising message increases (Gardner, Mitchell & Russo, 1985).

Advertising Message Involvement Antecedents

There are many factors that are likely to influence a consumer's level of advertising message involvement. Advertisers are not helpless. There are tactics they can employ to increase consumers' motivation to attend to advertising. One critical factor is information meaningfulness (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983). If advertisers are going to include specific performance information in advertising, then it needs to be information about benefits that are most important to consumers. If the message is going to include quality cues, then it needs to discuss quality cues that people perceive to be reliable predictors of quality. If the message goal is to make people feel good, then the visual (e.g., people, situations, scenery) and audio (e.g., music) tactics used to create positive emotions must be ones that are most likely to touch chords among the advertiser's customer target market.

Advertisers can also employ certain executional tactics to increase advertising message involvement. Unique, vivid visuals, sounds and dialogue are more likely to capture and hold attention than common ordinary executions (Berlyne, 1970; Reyes, Thompson & Bower, 1980). And executions that are emotionally intense are more likely to grab attention than emotionally flat executions (Silk & Vavra, 1974).

Despite these tactics, there are several factors that influence advertising message involvement that are at least partially out of the control of advertisers. As a result, advertisers cannot necessarily influence the level of AMI at which an advertisement will be processed. This has strong implications for advertising effectiveness. Four relatively uncontrollable antecedents of AMI include (a) anticipated brand response involvement, (b) the extent to which the consumer perceives a need for additional information before making purchases in the product category, (c) the consumer's interest in the advertised product category, and (d) consumer distraction at the time of advertising message exposure.

If consumers typically behave "indifferently" at the point of purchase because they don't perceive any differentiation or risk associated with purchases in that product class, then there is no logical reason why those people would bother deliberately attending to quality cue or relative performance type advertising information in that product category. Unless an advertiser can somehow increase a consumer's belief that there are differences between brands or that there is social, utilitarian or economic risk associated with purchases in the product category, it is likely to be very difficult to get people to attend to and learn information at a higher level than what they expect to use when they make their brand choice. Take the shampoo example. People that don't believe there are any differences between shampoos may enjoy looking at the beautiful actress in the advertisement and they may listen to the background music, but they are less likely to pay much attention to the specific message information. People that do believe there are differences, people that do associate risk with purchases in the product category are more likely to focus their attention on the message.

Many people may be likely to make their brand choices in a product category by either "optimizing" or "satisficing," but they still may not be likely to expend much energy attending to specific performance or quality cue type information in

advertising if they do not believe they need additional information before they make their brand choice (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983). Some people may believe they have learned all the information they need to make a brand choice through their prior experience with using brands in the product category. Other people may simply believe that they don't need advertising information before they make their brand choice, perhaps because they find it to be less credible than other information (Smith & Swinyard, 1983). These people may believe they will need information before they make their choice, but that they can get it at the point of purchase through package information, salesmen or some means other than advertising. Unless advertisers unleash messages that convince the former group that they do need additional information or convince the latter group that they are giving them valuable information that they cannot get elsewhere, then these people are not likely to deliberately attend and learn advertising message information.

Another factor that may prevent people who are likely to optimize or satisfice at the time of brand choice from learning relevant information in advertising is lack of interest in the product category. Although interest in any given product category changes from one individual to the next, some product categories tend to be inherently interesting to people, others are not. Interest alone can influence the degree of attention paid to advertising (Muhlbacher, 1985). Automobile, home electronics and clothing advertisers benefit from the high interest many people have in their categories. This high interest increases the likelihood that people will pay attention to their advertising. Battery, paper towels and condiment advertisers are likely to be hurt by the intrinsically low interest many people have in their product categories. These advertisers must work harder to develop creative executions to draw consumers' attention towards their advertising messages.

Finally, distractions at the time of advertising message exposure can direct consumers' attention away from advertising. People do not watch television or listen to the radio in isolation. Commercial time can also be conversation time, reading time, snack time, etc.

Advertising Message Involvement Effects

The RAM predicts that advertising message involvement is a primary determinant of the level of information that consumers most effectively encode in memory at the time of advertising message exposure and, hence, remember at the time brand purchase decisions are made.

High advertising message involvement. High product class interest, high expected brand response involvement and a strong perceived need for information are all expected to contribute to high advertising message involvement. When AMI is high, consumers are expected to focus their attention on advertising message information that facilitates the specific comparison of the brand relative to its competitors. Message information relating to specific product attributes and benefits is likely to be attended. Lower level information is likely to be used to judge the credibility of the specific performance information, but not to directly evaluate the brand. Consumers are expected to process the advertisement in a manner that will allow the formation of relative performance beliefs either at the time of advertising exposure or at the time of brand choice (e.g., better feature, better product).

If consumers believe that no information in the advertising message is pertinent to the formation of relative performance beliefs, then consumer attention to the message is likely to "switch off" (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984), or worse, consumers may have a strong negative reaction that may transfer to the

brand (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Think about a commercial for a sports car. The RAM predicts that highly involved consumers will focus their attention on those aspects of the advertising message that will help them to form specific performance beliefs about the car. If a consumer is most concerned with the social implications of car ownership, then he will seek out information in the advertisement that will help him to gauge the social status of this sports car relative to others. If he is most concerned with the utilitarian aspects of sports car ownership, he will seek out message information on, for example, the relative acceleration or handling of this car versus other sports cars. If the advertisement has no information that can be used to form relative performance beliefs, then the person is likely to either withdraw his/her attention from the ad, or worse, become frustrated and react negatively to the ad, and perhaps the car. The advertisements for Nissan's Infiniti that did not show the automobile are likely to have frustrated many people.

Moderate advertising message involvement. Lower product interest, expected brand response involvement and/or perceived need for information are expected to contribute to moderate AMI. When AMI is low, consumers are likely to be motivated to comprehend the advertising message, but not to analyze and integrate the implications of specific message claims with other brand-related or competitive information in memory (Krugman, 1965). Consumers are not expected to seek out specific relative performance information or expend the cognitive effort to transform message information into relative performance beliefs. Instead they are more likely to attend to quality cue type information and make absolute mental judgements or summaries about the ad (e.g., good ad, good spokesperson), the brand's benefits (e.g., the brand has this feature, this feature is good) and the product in general (e.g., good brand). They are not expected to make

relative judgements about the advertisement (e.g., better ad, better spokesperson) or the brand (e.g., better brand, better feature) because they are not expected to deliberately relate or integrate brand information in the advertisement with information about other brands (See Fiske, 1982; Alba & Hasher, 1983).

Recall the shampoo example. The RAM asserts that consumers exhibiting a low level of AMI are most likely to attend to quality cues. They are neither motivated to learn "details" about the brand because they are not interested in such information nor do they expect to ever use it. It is easier to draw a quick evaluative inference from this type of information than it is from more specific performance information. Assume that Jacqueline Bissett is the actress in the ad. Both Jacqueline Bissett's credibility and the hairdresser endorsement are easily understood and have direct evaluative implications. If a consumer wants to get a "quick read" of the brand from the advertising message, it makes more sense to attend to the quality cues.

Quality cue type information is also more likely to be remembered than specific attribute claims when one is not motivated to deeply process and integrate the contents of an advertisement into memory because simple, novel information is easier to remember than complex, common information (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987). Quality cue information is often more novel than specific performance information. Many shampoos have hair control ingredients, but only one brand can be endorsed by Jaqueline Bissett. Consider product classes that debate ceaselessly about who has the most of a given benefit, for example, the amount of pain reliever in aspirin, the fiber content of cereals, the acceleration rate of sports cars. It is difficult even for a motivated consumer to remember each brand's specific claims on these common benefits. The barrage of claims interfere with each other in memory and make it difficult for consumers to learn and access it.

(Hoch, 1984; Keller, 1987). It is easier to remember the general themes of advertisements in these product classes than it is to remember the values of the debated benefits (e.g., the milligrams of pain relief offered by Bayer, Excedrin, Tylenol, etc.) because the themes are generally more novel, more arousing and, hence, easier to efficiently encode into brand memory than the factual content (Anderson & Bower, 1980).

Very low advertising message involvement. Very low product interest, anticipated brand response involvement and/or little or no perceived need for brand information are likely to lead to very low AMI. Strong distractions at the time of advertising exposure can also lead to very low AMI even if these other conditions are not present. The RAM presumes that when advertising message involvement is very low, there is no motivation to attend to brand information in the advertising message. Consumers are not expected to expend any mental effort to comprehend the message nor are they expected to intentionally generate any absolute or relative mental summaries or judgements of the brand or any of its benefits.

Consumer attention to any executional themes is expected to be purely a function of their novelty and affective qualities. As a result, the only type of brand information that is likely to be remembered is simple affective reactions to executional elements of the advertising that became effortlessly associated to the brand name through repeated exposure (Zajonc, 1980; Bargh, 1984).

Consumers exhibiting very low AMI while watching the shampoo commercial are not expected to attend deliberately to any message elements. As a result, memory for specific claims, whether they be quality cues or relative performance information is expected to be poor. If, however, viewers found the music, luxurious setting, or the model's beauty highly arousing, or if they were constantly exposed

to the brand name, it is possible that positive feelings could become linked to the brand automatically. Consumers may not be able to explain accurately the reason(s) why their perceptions became more positive.

Summary

The RAM proposes that consumer advertising message involvement is a strong predictor of the level of information that is most likely to be attended, comprehended and integrated into brand memory at the time of advertising message exposure and, hence, accessible to the consumer at the brand response occasion.

When AMI is high, consumers prefer to attend to relative performance type information. As a result, it is the level of information that is likely to be most accessible at the brand response occasion. When AMI is low, quality cue type information is most likely to be attended and efficiently encoded into memory at the advertising exposure occasion and thus, be more accessible at the brand response occasion. And, when AMI is very low, inherently interesting executional elements of advertising are all that is likely to be attended at the advertising exposure occasion and, as a result, remembered at the time of brand choice.

The major implication of the effects of AMI is that advertising effectiveness cannot be completely controlled by advertisers. An advertising message may contain the correct level of information, information that is more relevant than anything the consumer could find at the point of purchase, information that the consumer would seek at the point of purchase; but if the consumer is not attending and integrating this information into memory at the time of advertising message exposure, the advertisement is not likely to influence brand

choice because the "correct" level of information is not likely to be efficiently stored into memory.

Well designed advertisements can fail because advertising message involvement and brand response involvement have different antecedents. Two of AMI's "uncontrollable" antecedents, product category interest and the perceived need for information, create the potential that advertising message involvement will be different, usually lower, than brand response involvement. When this happens, advertising is less likely to be effective because the "correct" level of information is less likely to be attended to and stored into memory at the advertising exposure occasion. For example, a consumer may use a satisficing strategy at the point of purchase, but due to a low perceived need for information and/or low product category interest, that consumer may have not paid sufficient attention to a well designed ad containing reliable quality cues when he/she was exposed to it. As a result, the ad is ineffective. Other information will drive the brand choice decision at the point of purchase.

Advertising Effectiveness

Four Prerequisites to Effective Advertising

The RAM identifies four necessary and mutually sufficient conditions that advertising must meet to have the highest probability of directly influencing brand choice.

The first condition is information availability. Before advertising can have any opportunity to influence brand choice, it must leave an imprint in consumer memory (Kisielius & Sternthal, 1984). Advertisements must be presented at times and in places where consumers will be exposed to their contents.

Advertisements must also affect consumer attention in a way that the message, not just the execution, will be attended, comprehended and stored into memory. If a consumer is not exposed to an advertisement, or if a consumer is exposed to an advertisement but neither attends or comprehends the message, then advertising has next to no chance of being effective.

The second condition is level relevance. Advertising effects are level relevant if there is a one-to-one correspondence between the level of information sought by the consumer to discriminate brand alternatives at the point of purchase (i.e., pure affect, quality cues or relative performance information) and the level of information encoded into memory at the time of advertising exposure. If, for example, consumers are seeking quality cues at the point of purchase and quality cues were encoded into memory at the time of advertising exposure, then advertising effects are level relevant. If, on the other hand, consumers are making brand selections on the basis of relative performance information, but encoded advertising effects are limited to simple affective information, then advertising is not level relevant.

Two requirements must be met to maximize the likelihood that advertising effects in memory will be level relevant. First, advertisements need to be designed to emphasize the "correct" level of information as determined by expected consumer brand response involvement. Second, consumer advertising message involvement needs to correspond to brand response involvement.

Using the shampoo commercial example, if an advertisers' consumer target market is expected to satisfice at the time of brand choice, then advertising effects are most likely to be level relevant if the shampoo advertising emphasizes quality cues rather than pure affective information or specific performance information. The quality cue information may be an expert endorsement or survey research evidence that three out of four hairdressers recommend its critical control

ingredient. Level relevance will be maximized if this commercial is processed at the middle level of advertising message involvement. At this level of involvement, consumers are expected to be most likely to attend to the quality cue type information in a manner that it will be accessible at the brand response occasion.

The third condition is relative accessibility. Relative accessibility refers to the probability that level relevant advertising effects will be accessed at the time of brand choice. Level relevant advertising effects may be available in memory, but the amount of effort required to retrieve them relative to other sources of information such as past usage experiences or package information can inhibit their retrieval at the point of purchase.

The relative accessibility of level relevant information is a direct function of how easily that information can be retrieved at the point of purchase relative to other accessible level relevant information such as package information or past usage experiences. Relative accessibility is influenced both by non-motivational (e.g., message design factors, repetition, package or POP tie-ins) and motivational (e.g., consumer effort to attend, comprehend and integrate the advertising message into memory) factors.

The relative accessibility of advertising information becomes increasingly important as brand response involvement decreases. As BRI decreases, consumers are expected to expend less effort to search their memories for relevant information. When BRI is high, consumers are motivated to deliberately search for relevant information regarding every brand in their consideration set. When BRI is low, consumers are only expected to search until they access a quality cue that allows them to confidently select a brand. When BRI is very low, consumers are not expected to deliberately try to recall any information from memory. According to the RAM, then, relative accessibility is a more critical issue to

advertisers promoting brands to consumers that are not involved in the purchase process.

The third condition is relative relevance. Assuming that an advertising effect in memory is level relevant, its relative relevance is its perceived ability to better, more reliably discriminate brand alternatives than other level relevant information such as package information, salesperson advice, usage experience memories, etc. Within each of the three levels of information, the RAM supposes that consumers encode, access and use information they perceive to be most reliable and to avoid and discount implications of less important information.

The relative relevance of advertising information becomes less important as brand response involvement decreases. Optimizing consumers are expected to take the effort to locate and use the information they believe to be the most reliable discriminator of brand alternatives; relative relevance is important. Satisficing consumers seek only a reliable brand discriminator, not necessarily the best discriminator; relative relevance is less important. Indifferent consumers do not deliberately seek or use any information to base brand choice, relative relevance is not considered.

Maximizing Advertising Effectiveness

Within the context of the relevance-accessibility model, several steps can be taken to meet the conditions outlined above. The first two steps are unique to the RAM, but also consistent with much of the consumer involvement literature. The next three steps are not unique to the RAM but are cast within the context of the RAM's major propositions.

First, advertising strategists need to correctly predict the brand response involvement of the consumers they intend to target. This knowledge will reveal which level of information needs to be emphasized in advertising. Brand response

involvement can be predicted by studying its primary antecedents, particularly perceived product risk and product differentiation. For example, in the case of paper towels, if strategists learn that their target consumers perceive little or no substantive differences between brand alternatives and no serious negative consequences associated with a nonoptimal purchase, then they can conclude that brand response involvement is very low.

Second, advertising messages must communicate level relevant information. If brand response involvement is expected to be high, then the advertising message should communicate relative performance information. If it is expected to be very low, then it should build brand and package awareness and effectively associate pure affect to the brand. For example, if the consumer target for a new sports car is expected to be in a state of high brand response involvement during the automobile purchase process, then to impact directly on brand choice, advertising needs to contain information on factors such as acceleration, braking, handling, styling, comfort, status, etc., relative to other sports car alternatives. If the consumer target for paper towels is expected to be in a state of very low BRI during the purchase process, then to impact directly on brand choice, advertising need only increase brand name and package familiarity and associate good feelings to the brand.

Third, advertising messages must communicate relatively relevant information. Once the level of information the target market is expected to use to make the brand choice is identified, research is needed to identify the best quality cue, the most important performance benefit and/or the most arousing, compelling execution to associate affect to the brand. In the case of the sports car, if BRI is expected to be high, then research needs to determine which performance dimension is the most important to communicate through advertising.

Fourth, the advertising message must be designed to maximize its relative accessibility to the consumer target market. Tactics strategists can use to improve relative accessibility include communicating the message in a novel and arousing manner, repeating the message throughout the advertisement, communicating the message through multiple sensual modes (words, sounds and pictures), focusing consumer attention on the message, not the execution, and heavy repetition schedules.

Maximizing the relative accessibility of advertising information is not something that advertisers can control completely. Advertisers can influence it by designing relevant advertising messages with compelling executions, but they cannot control consumer advertising message involvement at the time of advertising exposure.

The Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution

The RAM presumes that advertising effectiveness is most likely to be maximized when steps one through four above are accomplished and consumer advertising message involvement corresponds to consumer brand response involvement. When consumer advertising message involvement and brand response involvement correspond, advertising has the best chance of being effective because the level of information that is sought by the consumer at the time of brand choice is most likely to correspond to the most accessible advertising effects in memory.

For example, if a consumer's brand response involvement is moderate when selecting a shampoo, then the RAM predicts that the person is most likely to seek a quality cue to select a brand at the point of purchase (e.g., top selling brand name). If the consumer also experienced moderate advertising message involvement when exposed to the shampoo commercial, then the persuasive effect

of the quality cues presented in the advertisement are most likely to be highly accessible at the brand response occasion (e.g., spokesperson credibility). When both AMI and BRI are moderate, quality cues are most likely to be sought at the brand response occasion and the effects of quality cues in the advertising message are most likely to be highly accessible at the brand response occasion.

If, on the other hand, the consumer experienced very low AMI when exposed to the advertisement, then the advertisement is expected to have a significantly lower chance to influence consumer choice because the quality cue information in the message is expected to be less accessible at the point of purchase. The consumer is not expected to have deliberately attended to the quality cue information in the advertising. The advertising effect that is more likely to be accessible in this situation, free-floating affect, is expected to be perceived as less relevant to the consumer. Rather that base a choice on advertising information in this situation, the consumer is expected to use a quality cue from some other information source.

Summary

The Relevance-Accessibility Model of Advertising effectiveness has several key implications for the planning and implementation of advertising strategy. First, it stresses the importance for advertisers to understand more "global" aspects of consumer decision-making, not just tactical methodologies such as benefit segmentation. In order to develop a sound advertising strategy advertisers must first be able to ascertain what level of information consumers are likely to be using when they make purchase decisions. Second, it asserts that advertisers need to focus on brand response involvement as the critical input to determine

whether to pursue an affective, quality cue or attribute based advertising strategy.

By studying the antecedents of advertising message involvement and brand response involvement, the RAM offers a means to predict those situations when advertising is most and least likely to be able to directly influence brand choice. In situations, where AMI and BRI can be expected to be relatively equal, advertising has the greatest opportunity to directly impact on choice. In those situations when AMI is expected to be less than BRI, advertising has less opportunity to directly influence brand choice. Effective advertising in this latter situation, requires more expert manipulation of the controllable antecedents of AMI (e.g., highly relevant message content and unique, arousing executional elements). In this situation it may be prudent to "downgrade" advertising's role to influence consideration rather than choice. It may be best advised for other elements of the marketing mix such as packaging, POP, sales promotion, distribution intensity and shelf space dominance to take greater priority than advertising.

What is Ahead in the Dissertation

The goal of this chapter was to provide a general overview of the RAM's major propositions. Chapter Two will provide a comprehensive review of the advertising effects literature that influenced the conceptualization of the RAM. Chapter Three will present the RAM's specific theoretical framework. Chapter Three will also isolate the central hypothesis to be tested in the dissertation.

Among others, the following hypothesis will be tested: All things equal, level relevant advertising will be most effective when AMI corresponds to BRI. For

example, when BRI is high, advertising will be most effective when it emphasizes relative performance information and when AMI is high. Similarly, when BRI is very low, advertising will be most effective when it emphasizes pure affective information and when AMI is very low.

Chapter Four explains the experimental design and methodology to test this hypothesis. Chapter Five details the experimental results and their immediate implications. Chapter Six offers a more general discussion of the implications of the research and the model.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Supporting evidence for the RAM's axioms and propositions can be found in several streams of research. This chapter will review the elements of these streams that influenced the development of the Relevance-Accessibility Model of Advertising Effectiveness (RAM). In order of discussion, this chapter will review attitude-behavior consistency, the role of consumer elaboration and involvement on evaluation, the role of automatic processing and affect on evaluation and hypothetical construct perspectives on advertising effects (e.g., attitude toward the ad).

Familiar perspectives with few conflicting points of view, at least at the level of generality at which they will be discussed, will be reviewed more briefly than more recent, controversial evidence. In these latter cases, conflicting research results will attempt to be reconciled as they pertain to the RAM by examining boundary conditions and methodological limitations.

With a few notable exceptions, most of the research reviewed in this chapter focuses on consumer activities at the advertising exposure occasion (AEO), not the brand response occasion (BRO); most commonly it does not separate the advertising exposure occasion from the brand response occasion. Also, most research on communication effects has used measures of brand attitudes or purchase intentions rather than choice as the primary dependent variable. As a

result, support for the RAM's propositions about consumer choice activity at the BRO can often only be inferred, not directly empirically demonstrated.

Attitude-Behavior Consistency

Introduction

Attitudes play a central role in models of consumer behavior. Theoretically, often studied and emulated approaches such as the classic hierarchy of effects (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961; Palda, 1966; McGuire, 1974), the Fishbein model (1965), the Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) and the Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) focus on the process of changing or modifying brand (or object) attitudes. Methodologically, the vast majority of communication effects research in the past few decades has relied on paper and pencil measures of brand attitudes and purchase intentions to test the persuasive impact of independent variables. Based on the literature, it is fair to say that an explicit (i.e., theoretical) or implicit (i.e., methodological) assumption of almost all models of communication effects is that advertising ultimately affects behavior by modifying brand attitudes.

The RAM departs from this philosophy. The RAM does not espouse the position that advertising-generated changes in cognitive structure necessarily cause or reflect a change in attitude. Instead, it advocates that advertising more typically changes the informational or affective content of brand memory that may or may not later be deliberately or undeliberately invoked to make a brand purchase decision.

Ultimately, consumer behavior entails choice and consumption, not brand attitudes. There is no compelling theoretical reason for brand attitudes to be the

focus of study in consumer research. Methodologically, brand attitudes are convenient substitutes for measures of real or simulated choice, particularly since their interval structure permits the use of ANOVA and multivariate statistical packages to analyze empirical research results. But the only real justification for the use of brand attitude measures en lieu of choice measures in research is if they are reliable surrogates of choice. However, there is no strong, consistent evidence that this is the case. In fact, brand attitudes rarely explain more than 15% of the variance in consumer choice decisions (See Wicker, 1969; Smith & Swinyard, 1983). The weight of the evidence suggests that far too much credence has been placed on the notion that brand attitudes measured at time A reliably predict behavior at time B.

Based on the evidence, the position of this thesis is that research on communication effects needs to shift away from the traditional perspective that advertising influences brand attitude which in turn influences choice to the perspective that advertising influences memory structure which influences choice. This latter perspective accepts the potential that a previously generated brand attitude may predict choice, but it also allows for the probability that raw information in the form of pure affect, choice cues or relative performance information may be more predictive of choice.

Several reasons for this perspective will be presented. First, it is questionable whether stable brand attitudes naturally exist in many product categories (Lastovicka & Bonfield, 1982). Second, in those product categories where stable brand attitudes do exist, direct brand experience rather than persuasive communication is more likely to mediate their formation. Third, in the event that a persuasive communication does mediate the formation or modification in brand attitude, the necessary conditions for that attitude to directly mediate subsequent behavior severely constrains the likelihood of that event.

For these reasons, the RAM proposes that it is more important to look at advertising in the context of its ultimate contribution to choice processes that discriminate brands rather than its influence on attitude formation, which may be unrelated to choice. In other words, it is a more important goal for advertisers to communicate the specific information that will be used to discriminate brand alternatives than it is to communicate information that will elicit a positive attitudinal response towards the brand.

A third perspective on the role of brand attitudes in the choice process is what might be termed the "bias perspective". Fazio (1986) describes a chain of events whereby salient brand attitudes bias the accessibility and interpretation of information used in the choice process, thus biasing choice in the direction of the salient brand attitude. A considerable body of research in addition to his own supports Fazio's proposition (Isen, 1984; Owens, Bower, & Black, 1979; Bargh, 1984; Alba & Ofir, 1984; Hastorf & Cantril, 1954).

Table 1
Communication Effects Perspectives

Traditional Perspective: Advertising-->Brand Attitude-->Choice
RAM Perspective: Advertising-->Memory Structure-->Choice
Bias Perspective: Advertising-->Brand Attitude-->Perceptual Structure-->Choice

Defining Brand Attitudes

The importance of the attitude concept dates back to the 1920s when behavioral scientists began to search for "black box" factors mediating behavior. Behaviorism and genetics were deemed unsatisfactory. As Smith & Swinyard (1983) observed, one problem with early definitions is that they presume a direct effect on behavior. Allport (1935) defined an attitude as, "A mental and neural state of readiness exerting a direct and dynamic influence upon the individual's

response." Similarly, Doob (1947) defined attitudes as, "An implicit response which affects subsequent overt responses." Certainly, a workable definition of attitude cannot presume attitude-behavior consistency.

There are two other requirements of a brand attitude definition within the context of a model of choice. First, the definition cannot presume salience at the time of choice. Attitude availability, let alone accessibility, is not a given at the time of choice (Fazio, 1981; Bargh, 1984; Kisielius & Sternthal, 1984). Second, given the renewed focus on the role of affect in decision-making (Gardner, 1986; Lutz, 1985), the differences between brand attitudes and other affective responses must be explicated clearly.

Here, a brand attitude is defined as a "deliberately formed brand evaluation." It is both conscious and cognitive; it is not free-floating affect as described by Fazio (1986). Linking brand attitudes with affect is not workable in the context of the RAM because there would be a serious confounding of attitudes with affect as information, the third level of information described in the model. However, the source of the attitude may be "hot" affective responses (e.g., a strong emotional response) or "cold" information (e.g., quality cues, specific performance information).

This definition assumes that attitudes are formed through a conscious cognitive process; they are products of deliberate expressions of summary evaluations. This definition not only distinguishes an attitude from the three levels of information described by the RAM, particularly free-floating affect; it also recognizes and conforms to the methodological realities of attitude measurement. Whenever an attitude is measured, that measurement by its nature forces a cognitive component and deliberate expression, whether it existed prior to the measurement or not (Lastovicka & Bonfield, 1982).

Do Brand Attitudes Typically Exist?

Brand attitudes cannot mediate behavior unless they exist. Most communications effects modelers assume they are tapping not creating brand attitudes in their research, but there are other points of view. Lastovicka and Bonfield (1982) argue that people are likely to store firm attitudes towards social issues, but not typically towards branded products. As a result, responses to attribute belief and importance scales in survey research may often be misleading and reflect temporary tendencies, created on the spur of the moment, simply because a question was asked (See also Feldman & Lynch, 1988). Lastovicka and Bonfield asserted that minor choice behavior can be best explained through principles of behavioral learning theory because low involvement decisions, which most brand purchases are thought to be, are unlikely to be governed by specific attribute beliefs.

There is theoretical support for this position. According to functional theory (Katz, 1960), in order for attitudes to be held toward a given object, the object must be related to the concept of self, linked to an individual's important values, relevant to an important social group and perceived to give differential need satisfaction relative to other related objects.

Using these criteria, it may be argued that consumers are unlikely to hold enduring attitudes towards brands in a great many product categories. The final criterion above adds particular insight into the problem of attitude development for many classes of branded products. It implies that consumers may have stable attitudes toward product categories (e.g., peanut butter, paper napkins), but not towards specific brands within categories (e.g., Skippy vs. Peter Pan peanut butter). The lack of perceived interbrand differences in many product categories minimizes the potential for differential need satisfaction among brand alternatives within the product class (i.e., ketchup, paper towels, salt, etc.).

According to concept formation theory (Rhine, 1958), people acquire denotative meaning about objects and issue, but evaluative and connotative meaning do not follow unless the brand carries significant personal importance.. If one takes takes the position that most brands do not carry significant personal importance, concept formation theory can used to argue that people are likely to acquire knowledge of a brand that allows them to identify (e.g., "Crest is a brand of toothpaste") and describe it ("It's made by Proctor & Gamble," "It's the number one brand." "It has fluoride."), but not necessarily to evaluate ("It's an excellent brand." "It's the best brand.") or prefer it ("I'm going to buy it next time I need toothpaste."). Emotive and primitive evaluative responses, such as those postulated to be created by advertising, may result in purchase behavior, but do not necessarily lead to cognitively based attitudes. For example, repeated exposure to the brand name and package can lead to exposure effect induced purchase (Zajonc, 1980), emotional associations "conditioned" to the brand by advertising can motivate buying (Kroeber-Riel, 1979, 1984), as can the operant effects of price discounting (Nord & Peter, 1980). All of these effects, however, neither require belief formation or attitude formation prior to purchase or after purchase.

Table 2
Concept Formation Theory

Denotative Cognition-->Conation--> Attitude (maybe, but not often)

An experiment conducted by Lastovicka and Bonfield (1982) supported the basic propositions of functional theory and concept formation theory as they relate to branded products. Their results also supported the notion that close-ended attitude measurement scales overestimate the presence of brand attitudes. The authors found that 92% of subjects displayed attitudes towards twelve popular

brands of bread, toothpaste, toilet tissue and automobiles on a close-ended attitude measurement task (i.e., semantic differential scale), but only 15% revealed attitudes on an open ended (i.e., free association) task. In contrast, 96% and 45% of respondents displayed attitudes on political issues on close-ended and open-ended measures, respectively. Despite the study's small sample size, these results differ significantly. As concept formation theory might predict, responses on the open end measure of attitudes tended to be strictly denotative for the branded products, but both denotative and evaluative for topical political issues.

The perspective that brand attitudes may be nothing more than measurement artifacts, particularly in low involvement decision situations is not new. Warnings of an over emphasis on deliberate information processing perspectives to explain decision-making behavior have been sounded from other sources as well (Kassarjian, 1977; Olshavsky & Granbois, 1978). Dissatisfaction with the explanatory power of models driven by hypothetical constructs has rekindled interest in behavioristic perspectives on consumer decision-making which do not even acknowledge the role of attitudes in communication effects and choice behavior The concept of persuasion without active consumer involvement is consistent with behaviorism and the principles of behavior modification (BMP). These principles act as an alternative, more parsimonious explanation than information processing, belief-based interpretations of attitude formation and change because there are fewer posited intervening steps between advertising exposure and choice. Marketing objectives can be accomplished by studying environmental conditions and manipulating them to influence consumer behavior (See Nord & Peter, 1980).

Does Advertising Typically Motivate Brand Attitude Modification?

Assuming that brand attitudes do exist in a given product category, it is still questionable whether advertising impacts behavior by mediating a shift in attitudes. Evidence suggests that brand experience, and not advertising, generally mediates the formation of stable brand attitudes. There are two reasons why advertising may not reliably mediate changes in brand attitudes. First, consumers often process advertising at a level of involvement that inhibits the elaboration of message content (Krugman, 1965, 1971). Without elaboration, there can be no change in brand attitudes (assuming the definition of brand attitude given above which states that attitudes cannot be formed or modified without the production of deliberate, evaluative cognitive abstractions). Second, advertising is not a credible source of information relative to direct experience. Even if processed at a level of involvement sufficient to motivate message content elaboration, the level of counterargumentation caused by advertising often inhibits the formation of strong attitudes (Smith & Swinyard, 1983).

The pioneering work of Krugman (1965) and Ray et al.. (1973) on low involvement communication processing paved the way for the wave of research on less deliberate, less involved communication response and decision-making processes. Their research questioned the notion that communications necessarily work by affecting brand attitudes through a classic hierarchy of effects type process.

When consumers are highly involved, Krugman (1965, 1971) affirms a classic hierarchy of effects type persuasion sequence. But when consumers are in a state of "low involvement," he claims that they react passively to advertising messages, generating few or no cognitive responses (Greenwald, 1968; Wright, 1973), or what he termed "conscious bridging experiences" from the message to the self. Krugman was among the first researchers to claim that a large proportion of

consumer advertising processing is characterized by far less deliberate cognitive activity than is assumed by hierarchies of effects perspectives. He asserted that under low involvement, attitude change results from "a gradual shift in perceptual structure," not deliberately induced changes in brand attitudes or its antecedents (e.g., attribute beliefs). "In short, with low involvement product choices, we might look for product adoption through gradual shifts in perceptual structure, aided by repetition, activated by behavioral choices and followed at some time by attitude change" (Krugman, 1965, pg 225).

The precise meaning of a "gradual shift in perceptual structure" was never clarified, but the essential point is that the behavioral effects of advertising in low involvement are not mediated by deliberate, conscious shifts in brand attitudes. This point of view is consistent with the RAM's perspective that advertising influences purchase behavior through other means than a direct mediational link through brand attitudes stored in memory.

The Ray et al.. (1973) research program at Stanford University provided strong empirical support for Krugman's gradual shift in perceptual structure proposition. This research stream uncovered evidence for the existence of three hierarchies of communication effects. The Learning Hierarchy is roughly equivalent to a classic hierarchy conceptualization. The effects sequence is cognitions (e.g., message comprehension, belief formation), followed by affect formation (e.g., attitude formation); and eventually conation (e.g., purchase behavior). This hierarchy is assumed to be operative when consumers are involved in the purchase, presumably because clear, significant differences are perceived to exist among brand alternatives.

The Dissonance-Attribution Hierarchy is the reverse of the learning hierarchy. The persuasion sequence is behavior, affect, and cognitions. The authors presume its occurence in situations where consumers are involved in the

choice process, but for whatever reason (e.g., ability or opportunity constraints) are unable to distinguish the differences among brand alternatives. The uncertainty created by the purchase choice is postulated to motivate consumers to bolster their choice decisions through rationalizing processes that may include the search for supportive information. The output of this search is hypothesized to be attitude polarization and the formation of strong attribute beliefs supportive of the chosen brand.

The Low Involvement hierarchy follows the sequence cognitions, behavior, and affect. As predicted by Krugman (1965), brand choice is thought to occur prior to attitude change, presumably because advertising-generated shifts in brand cognitions occur imperceptibly and thus, do not result in conscious, deliberate prepurchase attitude shifts. This hierarchy is expected to be dominant when consumers are uninvolved with the purchase and/or perceive minimal differences to exist among brand alternatives (Ray et al. 1973; Robertson, 1976).

A substantial literature supports the proposition that direct object experience increases attitude-behavior consistency relative to vicarious experience (Smith & Swinyard, 1982, 1983; Abelson, 1976; Fazio & Zanna, 1981; Fazio, Powell & Herr, 1983). Smith and Swinyard (1982, 1983) propose that vicarious experience cannot typically lead to the formation of stable, belief-based brand attitudes because it provides less tangible evidence on which to base attitude formation. In the specific case of advertising, low involvement processing behavior and low credibility further suppress the formation of belief-based attitudes. Advertising can lead to positive approach tendencies that may initiate trial, but not committed purchase behavior. Only direct experience can lead to the formation of belief-based attitudes that can reliably predict behavior. This interpretation is consistent with the findings of Fazio and Zanna (1981) that an individual with an attitude derived from direct behavioral experience will hold that attitude with

greater confidence than an individual whose attitude is formed from indirect experience. It is also consistent with the behavioral perspective that vicarious reinforcement is not as effective as direct, personal reinforcement.

Smith and Swinyard's (1983) empirical work involving a new snack product supported their position. The correlation between attitudes and choice was .32 when attitudes were generated by advertising and .60 when attitudes were generated by direct product experience.

Attitudes formed through direct experience may also be more accessible than attitudes formed through vicarious experiences such as advertising. Fazio (1986) asserts that a stronger object-evaluation link is created when attitudes are formed on the basis of direct experience. Several experiments support this proposition (Fazio & Powell, 1984; Fazio, 1986). However, it is unclear whether the attitude behavior consistency enhanced by direct experience is due to the greater accessibility of a prior attitude, or greater accessibility of a prior behavior, which consumers then use to construct rather than access an attitude as self-perception theory would predict (Bem, 1972). So, while evidence strongly supports the proposition that direct experience leads to stronger, more confidently held attitudes relative to advertising, more research is needed to determine if direct experience enhances the strength of the attitude-object link in memory rather than a behavior-object link in memory that is used to infer attitudes.

Brand Attitude Accessibility

Assuming that brand attitudes are held in a given product category and that advertising is able to influence these brand attitudes, the attitude must still be accessed before it can influence brand choice (Kiselius & Sternthal, 1984; Biehal & Chakravarti, 1985; Fazio, 1986). This is no trivial matter. People may not retrieve their attitude towards a stimulus before they act. There is no guarantee

that there is anything, but the weakest of links between the representation of the object and the representation of the attitude in memory (Langer, 1978; Fazio, Powell & Herr, 1983; Bargh, 1984).

The likelihood that an advertising-generated brand attitude or any other attitude will mediate choice is a function of its salience at the time a decision is made. A study by Snyder and Swan (1976) demonstrates this point. Subjects were asked to act as judges in a simulated sex discrimination case. In an earlier task, subjects were asked to communicate their attitudes towards affirmative action. Half the subjects in the experiment were asked to recall their attitude towards affirmative action immediately prior to reading the case; the other half were not. The correlation between subjects' views on affirmative action and their case decisions was significantly higher among the subjects asked to review their attitude towards affirmative action prior to reading the court case.

A primary mediator of attitude accessibility is repeated attitudinal expression (Fazio, 1986). In one series of experiments, attitude accessibility was demonstrated to be a direct function of the number of times subjects were asked to verbalize an existing object attitude (Fazio, Chen, McDonel & Sherman, 1982). Accessibility was measured using a response latency measure. In subsequent experiments, Fazio found support for the potential of repeated attitudinal expression to lead to the spontaneous activation of attitudes when the attitude object is encountered (Fazio & Powell, 1984).

However, experiments by Fazio and Herr (1984) demonstrated that even highly accessible attitudes do not necessarily directly or indirectly (e.g., bias consumer decision processes) mediate evaluation. In one experiment, subjects were told they were about to read a legal case concerning affirmative action. In a 2 x 2 design, half the subjects were asked to prepare to reach a verdict as they read the case; half were told to memorize all the factual details, but were not asked to

reach a verdict. Also, half the subjects were asked to review their personal attitudes towards affirmative action prior to reading the case, and half were not. Attitudes towards affirmative action correlated strongly to the verdict only in the cell in which prior attitudes were rehearsed and subjects were asked to prepare to reach a verdict. In the memory condition, attitude-behavior correlations were low regardless of attitude salience. Apparently, subjects found the specific information more relevant to their decision than their attitudes on affirmative action. The findings suggest that conscious or subconscious attitudinal mediation of behavior is not a necessary outcome of attitude salience during the decision process. This finding is highly consistent with the RAM perspective that attitude, like any other element of a brand memory structure will only mediate choice when it is both accessible and relevant.

Brand Attitude Relevance

Even if consumers hold brand attitudes in a product class, and even if these attitudes can be influenced by advertising, and even if they are highly accessible in memory, there is still no guarantee they will mediate choice at the brand response occasion. The question thus remains when will attitudes formed at time A mediate choice at time B? Assuming that the conditions above are met, evidence indicates that the answer is when the attitude formed at time A is more relevant, i.e., more diagnostic than other salient information at time B.

Much of the available research on the effects of prior judgments and attribute information on evaluation or choice is not designed in such a manner that it can specifically address the above question. A large body of evidence demonstrates that memory-based judgments can dominate the evaluative implications of recalled attribute information on subsequent evaluation (Lichtenstein & Srull, 1983; Lingle & Ostrom, 1979; Dreben, Fiske & Hastie, 1979). An equally large

body of evidence reveals a dominance of attribute information over previously formed judgments (Reyes, Thompson & Bower, 1980; Biehal & Chakravarti, 1986; Chattopadhyay, 1986). The research successfully demonstrates effects of judgment and effects of attribute information, but does not specify clear boundary conditions for these effects other than accessibility and does not offer a theoretical framework to explain or predict when each effect is likely to occur.

Feldman and Lynch (1988) built a framework that is able to reconcile much of the conflicting evidence in the literature. In the context of brand choice, Feldman and Lynch propose that the likelihood that any cognition about a brand will be used to choose that brand is a function of three factors: the accessibility of the input in memory, the accessibility of alternative brand cognitions in memory and the relative diagnosticities of the inputs. These conditions parallel the two general axioms of the RAM regarding the potential of advertising generated cognitions to mediate choice: superior accessibility and superior relevance.

Brand attitudes that are the output of deliberately formed summary evaluations (i.e., cognitive elaboration) are likely to have an accessibility advantage in memory over more specific brand information because they are likely to be more efficiently stored in brand memory (Wright, 1980; Anderson, 1983; Alba & Hutchinson, 1987). For this reason, they are more likely to become the product of automatic processing (Bargh, 1984) and less likely to become the victim of output interference (Hoch, 1984; Alba & Chattopadhyay, 1986). This gives prior judgments a ceteris paribus accessibility advantage over other information. In Lichtenstein and Srull (1983), both attribute information and prior judgements were given an equal chance of mediating evaluation. In this scenario, judgments formed at time A were accessed and used in favor of the attribute information at time B. However, there was no reason for subjects to make the effort to use attribute information in their evaluation at time B. The

evaluation environment was exactly the same at time A and time B; there were no brands, no new brand information, no changes in the purported usage occasion, etc. In reality, especially when comparing an advertising exposure occasion and a brand choice occasion, there will almost always be differences. In an advertising exposure occasion, memory for other brands is likely to be limited relative to the brand choice occasion. Competitive information is also much more likely to be highly accessible at the brand choice occasion.

If there is a change in the evaluation environment between the time of attitude formation and the time of subsequent evaluation, evidence suggests that specific performance information is more diagnostic than prior summary evaluations and, hence, will be used in favor of prior judgments. Evidence suggests that consumers perceive prior judgments to be non-diagnostic (or in RAM terms, irrelevant) if new brands, attributes or usage situations are introduced into subsequent evaluation contexts (Biehal & Chakravarti, 1986; Lynch & Srull, 1982). Experiments designed to test Lynch and Feldman's basic propositions have supported the framework (Lynch, Marmorstein & Weingold, 1988). In one experiment, subjects were put in "mixed choice" tasks where they were forced to choose between a previously evaluated brand and a new brand. Subjects relied on attribute information, and not the prior judgment to make the new evaluation if the attribute information was accessible, ostensibly because the prior judgment had no diagnostic implications in the new evaluation setting. A follow-up study demonstrated that even when specific attribute information is not accessible, subjects will use brand names as choice cues rather than rely on a prior judgments perceived to have little diagnostic utility to the choice situation (Lynch, Buzas & Marmorstein, 1987).

Brand Attitude Measures as Surrogates for Choice

Up to now, the discussion has focused on the likelihood and circumstances of advertising generated brand attitudes mediating choice through their retrieval and use as a choice cue. The discussion was largely theoretical. One may also examine attitude behavior consistency from a more methodological point of view. That is, one may agree that brand attitudes are not typically used as choice cues, but one may also argue that measuring brand attitudes at time A can be highly predictive of behavior at time B because a brand attitude measure simulates the choice process.

The assertion that brand attitudes measured at time A can reliably predict behavior at time B requires that two key assumptions be accepted. First, one must assume that the attitude formation process and the brand choice process are identical. The pool of information and the rules used to transform this information into evaluations must be identical for the outcomes to be reliably identical. Second, one must assume that the pool of available information, the accessibility and relevance of this information, and the motivation to use that information are unchanged from time A to time B. Evidence suggests that the validity of these two assumptions is highly questionable.

Bettman (1979) demonstrated that many identified choice-based strategies such as lexicographic, conjunctive and elimination by aspects do not require an overall evaluation of brand alternatives during the choice process, but rather only evaluation or recognition of specific performance attributes or quality cues. Other research affirms the position that different informational sets and evaluation strategies appear to drive attitude formation and choice decisions (Johnson & Russo, 1981; Bettman & Zins, 1977). If this is true, there is no reason to trust the ability of attitude measures to predict choice outcomes.

One major reason choice and judgment processes are likely to differ is a decision involvement gap. One antecedent of decision-making involvement is the perceived risk associated with the purchase (Robertson, 1976). There is little risk associated with forming a "wrong" attitude when asked because there are no real consequences associated with the evaluation. In many product classes, however, there is considerable economic, social and utilitarian risk associated to a "wrong" choice. This involvement gap between attitude and choice formation processes is likely to lead to evaluations based on different informational inputs and different decision rules. When this occurs attitude-behavior consistency should be low. For this reason, survey measurement procedures that simulate the true "state of mind" (e.g., involvement) at the time of choice are more predictive of choice (Wright & Kriewall, 1980).

Assuming equal levels of involvement at the time of attitude formation and choice and even identical evaluation processes, the correlation between brand attitude measures at time A and brand behavior at time B is still likely to be low unless involvement is very high. Momentarily activated cues have a disproportionate influence over judgments made about an object or related behaviors performed shortly after their activation (Wyer & Srull, 1986; Kiselius & Sternthal, 1984). Environmental influences have a tremendous effect on salience. Cognitions that influence evaluation are cued to memory by contextual factors and only a small subset of the available information will be accessed at any one evaluation episode (Feldman & Lynch, 1988). Since accessibility is a function of the time since the most recent activation of that cognition (Wyer & Srull, 1986; Anderson, 1983), attitudes measured at or near the time of advertising exposure are likely to be heavily biased by advertising content. Attitudes measured in another environment are likely to be driven by the most salient information in that environment.

Attitude-behavior consistency is likely to be particularly low when consumers engage in low involvement decision-making behavior. In such a scenario, the latitude of acceptance of alternative courses of action is likely to be high (Sherif, Sherif, Nebergall, 1973) and evaluations are likely to be a function of highly salient contextual cues. Assuming attitude measurement immediately follows exposure to advertising, the salient contextual cues are likely to be advertising effects. Assuming choice takes place in a store, the salient contextual cues are likely to be packages and POP information for both the "target" brand and competing brands. When involvement is high, attitude-behavior consistency should be higher because evaluations are more dependent on deliberately accessed rather than cued information.

Early critiques of attitude behavior consistency recognize that attitudinal measures often do not capture the effects of "other" factors that influence choice (Wicker, 1969; Ehrlich, 1969; Vinson et al., 1977). Although not explicitly stated, their observations imply inconsistencies between attitude and choice formation contexts and processes. Their remedy was to improve attitudinal measures by better simulating choice processes at the time of measurement.

Summary

Evidence has been presented that questions the theoretical and methodological bases for the primary role of brand attitudes in the study of communication effects. There are several barriers to the consistent use of brand attitudes as choice cues. First, brand attitudes may not be held towards brands in many product categories. Second, in categories where brand attitudes are held, they are more likely to be based on tangible brand experience rather than vicarious experiences such as advertising. Third, if an advertising generated brand attitude exists, it must be salient at the time of brand choice. Fourth, a salient

brand attitude must be perceived at least as relevant as other salient information at the brand response occasion. The Feldman and Lynch (1988) framework reconciles much of the conflicting research on the role of prior judgments in a choice context. Its stated conditions for an effect of prior judgments on choice, accessibility and diagnosticity, are quite consistent with the RAM perspective.

The ability of measures of brand attitude to accurately simulate future choice and thus act as reliable measures of communication effectiveness is also questionable. First, evidence suggests that attitude formation and choice processes are not identical. Informational inputs and evaluation rules are likely to differ. Second, unless involvement is very high, the effects of varying environmental cues and time delays (or lack thereof) on information accessibility in the communication context and the choice context are likely to lead to different informational inputs to the brand attitude formation process and the choice process. If this occurs, attitude-behavior consistency can be expected to be low.

These findings support two primary assertions of the RAM. First, affecting brand attitude should be neither a primary theoretical nor a methodological goal of advertising research. Second, advertising effectiveness needs to be measured at the brand response occasion, not the advertising exposure occasion.

The Impact of Consumer Elaboration and Involvement on Information Accessibility

Introduction

The preceding section of this chapter proposed that advertising typically may not influence brand choice by modifying brand attitudes at the advertising exposure occasion. Instead, advertising is presumed to work by affecting the

informational content of brand memory. Brand attitude formation is one possible outcome of advertising exposure, but other outcomes such as the encoding of affect, choice cues or performance beliefs can also lead to advertising effects at the brand response occasion. In other words, brand attitude formation at the advertising exposure occasion may be sufficient to mediate brand choice, but it is not necessary.

Both the perspective that advertising functions by influencing brand attitudes and the more general perspective that advertising functions by affecting the structure of brand memory assume that information accessibility moderates evaluation. The accessibility perspective forwarded in this thesis builds on the availability-valence (AV) hypothesis (Kisielius & Sternthal, 1984). The AV hypothesis presumes that limited processing capacity inhibits consumers from basing brand evaluations on all available information in brand memory. Instead, brand evaluation is a function of that subset of information in brand memory that is accessed at the time of brand evaluation. The net valence of accessed information determines the favorableness of the judgement.

Two key issues concerning this perspective are the focus of this section. First, what determines which information in brand memory will be most accessible at the time an evaluation is made? Second, which highly accessible information will be accessed and used by the consumer in making a brand choice? The first question raises the issue of accessibility. The second question raises the issue of relevance.

First, this section will discuss the effect of cognitive elaboration on information accessibility. A large body of literature in both cognitive psychology and consumer research establishes a direct relationship between elaboration and accessibility, and between elaborated information and evaluation. Next, the issue of consumer involvement will be raised. Two involvement constructs will be

discussed, i.e., advertising message involvement (AMI) and brand response involvement (BRI). Advertising message involvement is expected to moderate both the extent to which advertising information is elaborated and the type of information that is attended. Brand response involvement will be introduced as a construct that both moderates advertising message involvement and drives the perceived relevance of advertising message information at the time of brand evaluation. It will be proposed that both the relative accessibility and the relative perceived relevance of a piece of information in memory affect whether it is used or discounted at the time of evaluation. Finally, since anticipated brand response involvement is only one of a number of antecedents of advertising message involvement, the likelihood that a consumer's advertising message involvement and brand response involvement do not always correspond will be discussed.

The implications of this section for the Relevance-Accessibility Model of advertising effectiveness are as follows. First, advertising message involvement is a primary predictor of the type of information that is most likely to be encoded into memory at the advertising exposure occasion. Second, brand response involvement is a primary predictor of the level of information consumers find relevant and, hence, seek to discriminate brands at the brand response occasion. Third, since the advertising exposure occasion and the brand response occasion are usually distinct in time and space, and since AMI and BRI do not necessarily correspond, models of consumer behavior must clearly delineate each of their roles.

Cognitive Elaboration

Elaborations that reflect the meaning an individual derives from a single piece of information are more durable in memory than the message elements from which these inferences are derived. Empirical research in psychology and consumer research has demonstrated repeatedly that, over time, specific message

content decays in memory before cognitively elaborated summaries of the information (Watts & McGuire, 1964; Watts, 1967; Alba & Ofir, 1984; Neisser, 1981; Frederickson, 1975). Frederickson (1975) demonstrated that elaborations represent a higher proportion of total recalled information over time. Alba and Ofir (1984) attained similar results in a marketing context. Examining the temporal stability of message abstractions, they found that the proportion of abstractions in a recall task increased over a delay of approximately one week. Apparently, unelaborated message information decays significantly more quickly than elaborated material.

The positive effects of elaboration on memory are enhanced in "crowded" memory structures. Keller (1987) and Burke and Srull (1988) showed that recall of brand claims is significantly reduced by the amount of competitive advertising. Keller (1987) demonstrated that recall declines as competitive intensity increases. Recall of a test brand's claims was higher with one as compared to three advertised brands in the competitive mix. Unlike brand claims, however, recall of cognitive responses was not affected by competitive advertising intensity.

A follow-up study by Keller (1990), showed interference effects on the recall of cognitive responses, but only when there was competitive advertising for three brands, not one or two. Interference effects remained much greater for brand claims. Finally, when subjects were given a retrieval cue, recall of cognitive responses did not differ between the zero and the three competitor conditions. The cues had less impact on the recall of brand claims.

The cognitive response literature in consumer research blossomed after the work of Wright (1973) and has become a foundation of models of attitude change. The major premise of this literature is that cognitive responses evoked by a communication are a key mediator of the direction and degree of attitude change produced by the communication. Dozens of empirical studies have found

consistently that recipient modified and recipient generated responses to communications account for significantly more attitude variance than recall of message arguments. Apparently, message receivers rely on their own descriptive or evaluative reactions to message content rather than the content itself to form or modify brand based beliefs and attitudes (Wright 1973; Lutz & Swasy, 1977; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Belch, 1981, 1982; Toy, 1982). As Wright (1980) summarized, "Variations in people's verbalized thoughts often correlate significantly with their post message attitude statements, especially when the thought sampling is time-limited, the thought coding reliable and the subjects are involved in message processing."

Conversely, researchers have been unable to find any reliable relationship between message element recall and evaluation (Dreben, Fiske & Hastie, 1979; Haskins, 1964; Watts, 1967; Ross, 1982). Keller (1990) found that subjects' inability to recall brand claims did not influence target brand evaluation unless cognitive response recall was also impaired.

Why do cognitive responses mediate brand evaluation? First, unlike simple recall, cognitive responses add valence to a memory trace. Simple recall of a persuasive argument or product benefit cannot reveal if an argument has been rejected or accepted, or if a product benefit is perceived to add value to the product. Cognitive responses can be loaded with valence. Second, cognitive responses are more accessible than unelaborated information and have a greater probability of becoming salient at the time of brand evaluation. Finally, cognitive responses reflect an individual's reaction to those elements of the message that were worth attending at the time of message exposure, ostensibly because they were perceived to be more relevant to the person's viewing goals than other message elements.

Consumer Involvement

What determines which elements of a message will be attended and elaborated? The likelihood that any given element of a message will be attended and elaborated at the advertising exposure occasion and, thus, made more accessible at the brand response occasion is a function of consumer involvement.

Involvement has been conceptualized as an activation level at a particular moment, as opposed to a sequence of cognitive activities carried out subsequent to message reception, or a predisposition to respond to a specific stimulus (Cohen, 1982). The key feature of this conceptualization and others is that involvement is not confounded with its antecedents (e.g., novelty, intensity, an individual's goals, beliefs, and interests) or its consequences (e.g., arousal, attention, cognitive elaboration). By separating involvement from antecedent and consequent variables, a cleaner conceptualization emerges, a straightforward building block for theory development without excess baggage (Cohen, 1982).

Involvement per se is non-directional; it can be operationalized in terms of total activation, but there are no tangible consequences on subsequent cognitive activity until a directional indicator is added to the construct. It is the consequences of the involvement by product interaction (i.e., decision-making involvement) and the involvement by message interaction (e.g., advertising message involvement) that are of immediate relevance to the Relevance-Accessibility Model. Advertising message involvement and brand response involvement are more specific involvement conceptualizations that include direction. Their impact on advertising effects at the advertising exposure occasion and brand response occasion can be studied.

Advertising Message Involvement

Early research on the effects of issue involvement on message processing suggested that increased issue involvement leads to increased resistance to persuasion (Sherif & Hovland, 1961). The justification for this explanation was social judgement theory which postulates that high involvement narrows individuals' "latitude of acceptance" towards persuasive messages thereby increasing the probability that message arguments are counterargued or ignored (Sherif, Sherif & Nebergal, 1965). As involvement decreases, social judgement theory predicts that the latitude of acceptance widens increasing the likelihood of persuasion.

Subsequent research in social psychology, however, demonstrated that high issue involvement does not necessarily lead to increased resistance to persuasion. New evidence indicated it can lead to greater persuasion (Eagly, 1967; Chaiken, 1979; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979). Two major findings emerged from this stream of research. First, involvement increases the amount of thought consumers direct towards the communication and its message arguments. Second, as involvement increases persuasion becomes more dependent on the quality of arguments in the message. If arguments are strong, positive attitude change occurs; if arguments are weak, then negative change occurs.

Krugman (1965) first introduced the notion that consumer involvement with the advertising message is linked to the production of cognitive responses or elaboration evoked by the advertisement (Krugman, 1971; Mitchell, 1979, 1981; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979, 1981, 1983; Batra & Ray, 1982, 1985). He conceptualized involvement as "the number of conscious bridging experiences, connections, or personal references per minute between the viewers life and the stimulus" (Krugman, 1965, p. 128) and defined low involvement as the absence or near absence of these bridging experiences.

Empirical research has demonstrated repeatedly that unless a message receiver is in a high involvement processing mode, cognitive responses (1) will be few and (2) will be weakly related or unrelated to attitude towards the message object. Subjects' message relevant thoughts correlate more with brand attitudes under conditions of high rather than low involvement (Chaiken, 1979; Wright, 1973, 1980, Cacioppo & Petty, 1979; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Petty et al. 1983).

Petty and Cacioppo (1979) demonstrated that persuasive effects are more related to message argument cogency under conditions of high rather than low involvement. In the high involvement condition, significantly more counterarguments than support arguments were generated upon exposure to weak message arguments; the opposite occurred during exposure to strong arguments. In the low involvement condition, neither support or counterarguments production was affected by argument quality. Message relevant thoughts were significantly better predictors of attitude change in the high involvement condition; message recall was not related to attitude change in either involvement condition. Petty and Cacioppo's findings in this and other related experiments led to the conceptualization of the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM), which will be discussed later in this section.

Mitchell, Gardner and Russo (1980) replicated Petty and Cacioppo's (1979) findings. Rather than indirectly affect advertising message involvement by manipulating brand response involvement, however, they specifically instructed their subjects to either focus their attention on the brand related message arguments (brand processing condition) or on executional elements of advertising (nonbrand advertising). More cognitive responses were elicited in the brand processing condition, and cognitive responses in the nonbrand condition did not explain attitude differences as well as they did in the brand processing condition.

Qualitative Effects of Advertising Message Involvement. As advertising message involvement increases, information is better comprehended, better integrated into brand or product class memory structures, and, is more accessible. Below is a brief summary of research examining the consequences of differential involvement during message reception. Some researchers discuss effects in terms of the information that is stored in memory as a result of processing. Others speak in terms of the type of advertising information that is subsequently accessible and potentially able to mediate brand attitudes.

Despite the greater attentional focus on specific message arguments, message comprehension and information integration associated with high advertising involvement, low involvement processing can modify brand memory networks sufficiently to affect brand evaluation. Krugman (1967, 1971, 1980) speculated that low involvement effects are typically visual and processed predominantly in the right brain. As a result, they can best be measured through recognition measures. High involvement effects are verbal and processed predominantly through the left brain. He also proposed that since consumers are basically satisficers and act on the basis of familiarity, the subtle perceptual shifts created by low involvement processing are sufficient to change behavior. Although Krugman's work lacks a strong theoretical framework, his assertions have intuitive appeal. Many of his notions on the potential of persuasion without cognitive elaboration are consistent with subsequent work on automatic processing in cognitive psychology (Anderson, 1983; Bargh, 1984) and the rebirth of behaviorism as an appropriate framework for investigating low involvement behavior (Kroeber-Riel, 1979; Gorn, 1983; Nord & Peter, 1983). Persuasion without cognitive elaboration will be examined in more detail in the next section of this chapter.

In their treatise on the structure of knowledge in memory, Alba and Hutchinson (1987) make a distinction between analytic and holistic processing. Analytic processing is characterized by highly deliberate learning employing complex schemas containing specific rules to make informational classifications and brand evaluations. Holistic processing is characterized by less intentional, even automatic, processing that makes classifications and brand evaluations through similarity matching and the use of of category exemplars. Analytic processing is characteristic of highly involved experts, while holistic processing is characteristic of novices who do not have the necessary motivation, ability and/or opportunity to engage in analytic processing.

Others have described low and high involvement effects in terms of (a) the activation of memory structures during processing or (b) the effect of processing on memory structures. Mitchell (1981) associated high involvement with significant schema activation to integrate consumers' subjective interpretation of external information into internal memory and low involvement with minimal or no such schema activation. Gardner, Mitchell and Russo (1981) speculated that information processing under low involvement may be stored in episodic memory rather than a product class or brand semantic memory network. The inability of low involvement processing to affect semantic memory was expected to decrease the accessibility of attended information at a later time. This position is supported by Thorson (Cites).

In the research introducing the Attitude Toward the Ad construct, Mitchell & Olson (1981) produced evidence that when processing is impaired, affective reactions evoked by visual executional elements can lead to brand evaluations as extreme as attribute oriented message arguments. Given the relative absence of motivation to integrate information into brand or product class memory structures under conditions of low involvement, and the potential for incidental

learning of easily processed information, Batra & Ray (1981) prescribed molar strategic goals based on a high-low involvement dichotomy. Under high involvement, advertising should contain strong arguments about salient attributes. Given the deliberate nature of processing, light repetition schedules are sufficient. In low involvement, advertising should induce awareness-based affect through heavy repetition.

Leavitt, Greenwald and Obermiller (1981) catalogued a number of reasons why heavily repeated advertising processed at a low level of involvement can lead to persuasive effects without cognitive elaboration. First, reduced counterargumentation increases the likelihood that messages will "seep" into brand memory without counterargumentation and, hence, carry a positive valence (See Wright, 1973). Second, heavy repetition schedules can link a brand to a usage situation to the point where activation of the usage situation leads to the activation of the brand, thus increasing the probability the brand will be included in consumers' evoked sets in that situation. Third, heavy repetition can also change the relative accessibility of brand attributes used to judge brand alternatives and thus affect the decision rules used to discriminate brands; Wright and Rip (1980) called this problem framing. Finally, the massive advertising schedules designed to build brand name or package familiarity can associate positive positive feelings to brands through the exposure effect (Zajonc, 1980; Obermiller, 1985). Another means by which positive feelings can become associated to a brand that was not discussed by Leavitt et al. (1981) is affect transfer or what others call affective classical conditioning (Kroeber-Riel, 1979; Gorn, 1983; Baker, 1985).

Involvement as a Continuum. Until the mid 1980s, most involvement research dichotomized the construct; involvement effects were characterized as high or low. Definitions of high advertising involvement tended to be fairly

consistent; however, conceptualizations of low advertising involvement varied. Some researchers characterized the consequences of low advertising message involvement as processing devoid of any significant deliberate processing of the advertising stimulus (Krugman, 1965, 1971; Kroeber-Riel, 1979). Others characterized it only as an absence of detailed processing of specific message arguments (Mitchell, Gardner & Russo, 1981; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1983). If one was to think of involvement as a continuum rather that a dichotomy, it seems that the former conceptualization would be at the low end of that continuum while the latter would be somewhere in the middle.

Before the effects of involvement at the time of message reception can be studied systematically, a precise specification of the consequences of different levels of advertising message involvement on message processing is needed. Approaching this issue from the perspective of a network model of memory and the concept of spreading activation, Greenwald and Leavitt (1984) categorized advertising message involvement (AMI) into four categories along the involvement continuum. The categories are defined in terms of the extent of activation of internal memory structures and the corresponding level of meaning that is extracted and encoded into the brand concept and/or brand response schema. Examination of this typology suggests a correspondence between three of the four categories and the three levels of information identified in the relevance-accessibility model.

Greenwald and Leavitt (1984) term the lowest involvement category as preattentive analysis. Preattentive analysis involves the monitoring of background stimulation for the occurrence of novel, intense or goal-relevant events. If these events are perceived, then higher levels of processing are invoked. To date, there is no strong evidence that encoding at preattentive analysis can lead to any type of persuasive effect. However, advocates of subliminal persuasion

or the "mere exposure effect" (Zajonc, 1968, Moreland & Zajonc, 1977, 1979; Wilson, 1979) contest this position. Evidence for both of these effects is currently tenuous (Moore, 1982; Birnbaum & Mellers, 1979; Obermiller, 1985), but certainly cannot be ruled out. It is conceivable that affective reactions can be influenced by information that impinges on the nervous system, but does not penetrate the cognitive system. Inconsistencies between avowed attitudes and behavior, discrepancies between verbal and nonverbal information emanating from the same individual (Ekman & Friedman, 1969) and influences on human behavior that cannot be reported accurately by the cognitive system (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977) have all been offered as evidence for this non-cognitive path. Until evidence becomes more concrete, however, this investigation will be limited to the cognitive system.

The second category of advertising message involvement, focal attention, entails sufficient deliberate attention to identify the stimulus at the sensory level. In essence, focal attention leads to the activation of a stimulus' identifying node and other nodes that are automatically associated to that node in memory (Schiffrin & Scheider, 1977); however, it implies no deliberate cognitive activation of memory networks to comprehend the stimulus nor deliberate cognitive elaboration to describe the stimulus. Familiar objects are semantically identified and associates are activated automatically. The level of cognitive activity required to generate propositional facts about the stimulus is not present. Therefore, unfamiliar stimuli establish sensory traces, but no semantic elaboration Since stored affective responses to stimuli are efficiently encoded in memory and, as a result, are more subject to the effects of automatic encoding and retrieval than other levels of information (Bower, 1981; Bargh, 1984), it follows that focal attention processing can lead to the sufficient encoding of pure affect

either through a familiarity based mechanism (i.e., the exposure effect) or an associative mechanism (i.e., affective conditioning).

The third level of advertising message involvement is termed comprehension. Comprehension involves the deliberate activation of memory structures required to comprehend the global meaning of the advertising message as opposed to simply identifying its elements. Semantic analysis occurs, absolute abstractions of meaning may be generated, and evaluative inferences may be made on the basis of message content or absolute abstractions. There is, however, no deliberate integration of message-based propositions with brand associates currently in the brand concept or with brand associates in other brand concepts. As a result, absolute rather than relative brand meaning is extracted from the message unless the message explicitly is communicating relative information. Since the content of the message is not deliberately integrated with either the brand concept or the brand response schema, heavy repetition is required to facilitate sufficient semantic encoding.

Comprehension level processing is expected to lead to the encoding of absolute brand beliefs and message based quality cues such as source credibility, the number of message arguments, the global evaluation of the stimulus (e.g., Attitude Toward the Ad), etc. It is not expected to typically be sufficient to generate relative performance beliefs, because this form of associate requires integration at both the brand concept and brand response schema levels. Comprehension level associates are expected to be sufficient to derive absolute evaluations of the brand from a single inference or to provide input into non-compensatory decision strategies (Bettman & Park, 1980; Biehal & Chakravarti, 1982, 1985), but insufficient to act as reliable input into sophisticated compensatory decision strategies involving direct competitive comparisons along

multiple performance dimensions (Lutz, 1975, 1977; Bettman, Capon, & Lutz, 1974).

The final advertising message involvement category is cognitive elaboration. It is at this level that message information is explicitly integrated with semantic brand memory and evaluative schemas. Message information is not only processed, it is integrated with prior knowledge. Since information is integrated, memory traces are more durable (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987) and do not require massive repetition to become accessible (Anderson & Rivolli, 1984). It is at this level of involvement that message arguments must be perceived to be relevant and strong relative to prior knowledge to be persuasive (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Relative performance information is expected to be the primary encoding goal because consumers are seeking the most reliable, concrete evidence available. This information is sought and, if present and meaningful, it is expected to receive the most processing during exposure.

The Principle of Higher Level Dominance

Pure accessibility theses such as the availability-valence hypothesis (Kiselius & Sternthal, 1984) predict that all valanced information salient at the time of brand evaluation affects brand evaluation. Greenwald and Leavitt (1984) introduced the principle of higher level dominance to predict the level of advertising information that is most likely to mediate brand attitude formation or change after an advertising exposure. The principle predicts the domination of higher level information over lower level on the basis of relative accessibility.

Every successive level of advertising message involvement in the Greenwald and Leavitt typology is linked to a higher level of information: "....the effects associated with the highest level of analysis applied to a message should be dominant. For example, among attitudinal effects, affective conditioning - which

is associated with focal attention - should be outweighed by message-based persuasion effects, which should in turn be dominated by cognitive response based persuasion effects" (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984, pg. 588). Furthermore, each level of analysis is momentarily passed through to reach the next level. Before a consumer reaches comprehension level processing, he/she must pass through preattentive analysis and focal attention. Effects of the highest level of analysis applied to a message are expected to dominate any subsequent evaluation because they are more accessible than any effects encoded at lower levels of analysis. Effects at higher levels of analysis are also more accessible because each successive level involves more deliberate processing and integration into brand memory structure than the preceding level.

Essentially, the principle of higher level dominance presumes that once encoded, advertising effects are driven by relative accessibility. The most accessible advertising generated information in memory will mediate any advertising effect on brand evaluation. The principle allows for relevance effects, but these are presumed to occur at the time of encoding, not brand evaluation. As Burnkrant and Sawyer (1981) state, the perceived relevance or meaningfulness of a piece of advertising information at the advertising exposure occasion is a major determinant of the level of processing that the information receives. Relevant information can motivate higher advertising message involvement, while irrelevance leads to lower involvement.

The principle of higher level dominance examines advertising effects in the context of the advertising exposure occasion on the basis of a single exposure to advertising. In this scenario, it makes sense. When advertising effects on brand evaluation are studied in the context of a brand response occasion distinct in time and space from the advertising exposure occasion and in scenarios involving multiple exposures to advertising, the premise begins to break down.

There are two points of contention with the principle of higher level dominance in the context of the brand response occasion and multiple advertising exposures. First, there is no strong evidence that higher level information in memory will always or even typically be more accessible than lower level information. In certain scenarios, lower level advertising effects are likely to be more accessible than higher level effects. For example, simple affective associations evoked by the exposure effect (Zajonc, 1980) or affective conditioning are potentially products of automatic processing after many exposures. Effects of higher level information such as relative performance beliefs, due to their more complex structure in memory, are less likely to become subject to automatic processing effects (Bower, 1981; Bargh, 1984). Also, when one considers the high accessibility of lower level non-advertising effects (e.g., packaging, POP, etc.) at the brand response occasion, it is almost a certainty that higher level advertising effects must compete with lower level effects more accessible than the advertising. Second, there is no evidence to suggest that higher level information, if more accessible than lower level information, is always perceived to be more relevant to the evaluation task at hand. Highly accessible higher level information will not always dominate lower level information at the time of brand evaluation because consumers may believe it is not worth the effort to use higher level information in the evaluation. Consumers may have the ability and opportunity to meticulously compare brand alternatives across several performance dimensions, but may only be motivated to make the evaluation on the basis of an accessible quality cue such as source credibility (Robertson, 1976; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).

It is the position of this thesis that accessibility is a necessary but insufficient prerequisite for advertising effects to mediate brand evaluation. Highly accessible information can be accessed and discounted at the brand response occasion if it is not perceived to be relevant (Feldman & Lynch, 1988).

The dominance of higher level information over lower level information is not possible if it is not accessed, but ultimately its use over lower level information is also dependent on its perceived relevance relative to highly accessible lower level information.

Evidence from an experiment testing the relative mediating strength of three hypothetical constructs supports the notion of informational dominance through an accessibility and relevance mechanism rather than simply an accessibility mechanism (Baker, 1985). In this experiment, higher level information was dominant; however the results suggested that the dominance was not the result of accessibility, but because accessible lower order information was deliberately discounted.

In the experiment, subjects were exposed to a series of wrist watch advertisements for a test brand and competitors. Attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity were experimentally manipulated. Each ad also contained brand attribute information. Brand attitude measures were taken one day and one week after exposure in a between subjects design. Recall of brand attribute information and advertising execution information was also measured. Significant effects of brand name familiarity on purchase intention occurred, but only after a week's delay from exposure. Interestingly, the significant effects of relative brand name familiarity (i.e., a measure of subjective familiarity relative to competitors designed to capture the exposure effect) occurred only when (1) the accessibility of advertisement execution information and brand attribute information were at their lowest levels and (2) relative brand name familiarity was at its highest level. If simple accessibility drove results, brand name familiarity should have mediated brand attitudes in both the short and long delay conditions. Instead, it mediated evaluation only when higher level information (e.g., executional quality cues and relative performance information) was no

longer accessible. The same outcome held true for Attitude Toward the Ad. It mediated brand evaluation only when executional recall levels were high and brand attribute recall levels were low.

Brand Response Involvement Mediates Informational Relevance

Most research on advertising message involvement focuses on its consequences rather than its causes. Message processing depth or direction is manipulated and consequences are analyzed (Gardner, Mitchell & Russo, 1983; Batra & Ray, 1985). Other research begins with the brand response occasion and work backwards to predict how involvement with brand evaluation or choice is likely to affect advertising message involvement (Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann, 1983). This latter perspective is more complete because it focuses on both causes and consequences of advertising message involvement. Effects of advertising message involvement can be better understood if they are studied in the context of the construct's primary antecedents. One of the major antecedents of advertising message involvement is expected involvement with the brand evaluation or brand choice, termed brand response involvement.

Evidence indicates that brand response involvement is a primary determinant of the level of information that consumers perceive to be relevant at the time of brand evaluation (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Robertson, 1976). That is, brand response involvement determines the level of information that consumers seek to discriminate brand alternatives. The key implication for the affect of brand response involvement on brand choice is that relevant information, i.e., information that consumers prefer to use to discriminate brand alternatives, is not necessarily the highest level of information that is accessible at the time of evaluation.

The idea that people do not always prefer to make a brand choice by meticulously comparing brand alternatives across a series of performance dimensions is both intuitively appealing and heavily supported in the psychology and consumer research literature. People are cognitive misers; the degree of effort put into a brand choice decision is a function of the expected benefit of the effort (Wyer, 1986). If there is no perceived benefit to be gained from a highly deliberate information search involving specific comparisons of brand alternatives, then the decision process will be simplified (Bettman, 1973; Kassarjian, 1977; Olshavsky & Granbois, 1973; Nord & Peter, 1980).

Brand response involvement is a motivational construct embodying the degree of cognitive effort expended by the consumer in any given brand evaluation process. Involvement with a brand evaluation is strongly related to the perceived risk associated with that decision (Bauer, 1967; Assael. 1983; Kapferer & Laurent, 1984). Cox (1967) identified two components of perceived risk, amount at stake and uncertainty. Uncertainty or what may be termed as risk probability is the likelihood of making an incorrect or non-optimal brand choice. It is a direct function of the perceived similarity between considered brand alternatives on utilitarian, economic and social dimensions (Bettman, 1973; Ray et al. 1973; Robertson, 1976; Hugstad & Taylor, 1979). Amount at stake relates to the consequences that are likely to result from an incorrect or non-optimal brand decision. Consequences may be social, economic, or utilitarian. Bloch and Richins (1983) described this dimension as risk importance and noted that this dimension should not just be thought of as loss potential, but also the potential to gain by a correct or optimal decision.

Despite the widespread agreement that risk probability and risk importance are fundamental predictors of brand response involvement, there is no strong theoretical framework interrelating the various antecedents of brand response

involvement. Some researchers have laid the groundwork for such frameworks (See Kapferer & Laurent, 1985 & Muhlbacher, 1985). However, these efforts have done a better job of listing, justifying and empirically relating a set of antecedents to various types of involvement than they have at specifically modelling their causal effect on involvement and on one another. Research is needed to develop a framework that includes the two components of risk and other major antecedents such as product class interest.

Levels of brand response involvement have been linked explicitly to specific types of brand decision strategies and advertising processing strategies. That is, BRI is a primary predictor of both the type of information consumers use at the brand response occasion to discriminate brands and the level of advertising message involvement consumers at which consumers will process advertising.

Robertson (1976) used the terms low and high commitment consumer behavior rather than low and high involvement. He related high commitment behavior to Ray's learning hierarchy and low commitment behavior to his low involvement hierarchy. Ray's data indicated that the low involvement hierarchy was dominant (Ray et al.., 1973); others agreed (Kassarjian, 1977; Olshavsky & Granbois, 1973; Nord & Peter, 1980).

Robertson argued that commitment is maximized when consumers perceive a high number of "distinguishing" attributes among brands and a level of "salience" attached to these attributes. In a high commitment situation, consumers are active, information seeking and resistant to influence. Strong beliefs are held about brands, particularly the preferred brand. Advertising is typically a weak influence; it is received in an active mode, but is typically screened out or counterargued.

In a low commitment situation, few beliefs are held about specific brands. There is low cognitive resistance to advertising: "It is not worth the individual's

exercise of cognitive energy to reason on incidental matters of consumption" (Robertson, 1976, pg 20). The classic hierarchy of effects is collapsed to awareness followed by trial. Advertising can induce trial, which is the main means of information evaluation (See Smith & Swinyard, 1983). Since advertising is received in a passive mode, the weight of advertising rather than its content may be the key to sales. To be effective, repetition levels must be high. Decision-making is characterized by minimal cognitive effort.

Rothschild (1979) made a distinction between low involvement and very low involvement. He characterized low involvement by the use of a few heavily weighted attributes in a non-compensatory manner with satisficing, not optimizing, the decision goal. In extreme low involvement, he postulated that familiarity alone drives evaluation. High involvement decision-making is characterized by a large set of attributes combined in a compensatory manner. Information is centrally processed to arrive at a choice.

Brand response involvement is postulated to be a mediator of advertising message involvement. Empirically, it has been used to manipulate advertising message involvement (Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann, 1983; Chaiken, 1979). As stated by Shimp (1981), advertising message receivers are resistant to factual, attribute oriented ads in product classes perceived to have no real differences among brand alternatives, presumably because in these cases there should be little or no motivation to process message information. Advertisements that generate easily processed affective associations to the brand or which emphasize global evaluations are likely to be more effective in these cases.

A large body of research concludes that high brand response involvement leads to high advertising message involvement which in turn leads to communication based evaluations mediated by the perceived strength of message arguments. Low brand response involvement invokes low advertising message

involvement and message based evaluations mediated by quality or other cues. When involvement is low, brand evaluation has been mediated by source credibility (Chaiken, 1980; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983), Attitude Toward the Ad (Shimp, 1981; Lutz, MacKenzie, & Belch, 1982), affect transfer (Gorn, 1982), brand name familiarity (Obermiller, 1985) and recognition of the number (not content) of message arguments (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984; Alba, 1985). In all of these studies, when message processing involvement was high, evaluation was increasingly a function of the interpretation of performance related information.

The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) is perhaps the best known representation of this perspective. The model identifies two general routes to persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). The critical "switching mechanism" in the ELM model is issue involvement. When consumers are involved in the decision process they are active information processors and employ what is termed the "central route." Persuasion is a function of the active interpretation of message elements. When consumers are not involved in the decision process they are passive information processors and follow the "peripheral route." Persuasion is a function of persuasion cues and principles of behavioral learning theory.

Under the central route, message recipients attend to advertisement message arguments, cognitively interpret them and derive their brand evaluations on the basis of these interpretations. In essence, persuasion is dependent on the interpretation and integration of these arguments with existing brand knowledge. If messages are perceived to be strong, persuasion will occur. If messages are perceived to be weak, persuasion will not occur. This is highly consistent with the cognitive response literature which predicts that persuasion is a function of the

valence of recipient generated, message-related cognitive responses elicited during message exposure (Greenwald, 1968; Wright, 1973, 1980; Lutz & Swasy, 1977).

Under the peripheral route, persuasion is determined by persuasion cues. Persuasion cues are defined as "....any factors or motives inherent in the persuasion setting that are sufficient to produce an initial attitude change without any active thinking about the attributes of the issue or object under consideration" (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, pg. 158). Peripheral process effects do not rule out active thinking in the persuasion process, only active thinking about the object or its attributes. Peripheral effects, then, can range from active consideration of non-message elements to completely passive effects such as classical conditioning. Examples of active peripheral effects include evaluative inferences generated by a message source (Sternthal, Dholokia, & Leavitt, 1978; Chaiken, 1980) or recall of the number (not interpretation) of message arguments communicated in the advertisement (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984; Alba, 1985). Examples of purely passive effects include effects of music (Gorn, 1982; Milliman, 1978) or emotion (Kroeber-Riel, 1984; Ross & Ross, 1975) and are analogous to classical conditioning.

Some empirical studies do not support the ELM perspective that persuasion follows either the central or peripheral route. Instead, they tend to support a dual mediation of both routes when involvement is high and the dominance of the peripheral route when involvement is low (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986; Park & Young, 1984; Gardner, 1986). In defense of the ELM, most of these studies did not directly manipulate brand response involvement; they manipulated the direction of consumer processing through instructions to either attend brand related message arguments or executional elements of the advertising.

However, there appears to be some problems with the mutual exclusivity of the central and peripheral routes. A limitation of the ELM is that it does not

clearly discriminate evaluation processes involving deliberate cognitive effort from those which do not, nor does it clearly link different types of information with the two persuasion routes. The ELM's peripheral route embraces levels of cognitive effort ranging from total passivity (e.g., classical conditioning effects) to the highly deliberate consideration of executional elements of the advertising. The ELM's definition of peripheral effects presents a real problem in an advertising context. In advertising, executional (i.e., peripheral) elements are likely to contain hedonic attribute information (e.g., lifestyle congruency, image enhancement, reference group appeal). Thus, peripheral processing as defined by the ELM can include effects of relative performance beliefs, quality cues or simple affect.

Involvement Types Do Not Necessarily Correspond

Advertising effects research has never explicitly considered brand response involvement and advertising message involvement separately. There has been an implicit assumption that the two correspond. However, if one considers that advertising message involvement's antecedents include, but are not limited, to brand response involvement, it becomes reasonable to assume that the two do not necessarily correspond.

Several antecedents of advertising message involvement have been identified other than expected brand response involvement. The first three antecedents are likely to lower advertising message involvement relative to brand response involvement. The first is the need for information in decision-making (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983; Batra & Ray, 1982, 1985; Bettman, 1979). Consumers may expect to be highly involved at the time of brand choice, but may believe they do not need advertising information to aid their decision-making process. The

second is the perceived relevance of information to the specific decision task (Toy, 1982; Brock & Albert, 1978; Ostrom & Lingle, 1979; Loken & Hoverstad, 1985). Expected brand response involvement may be high at the time of advertising exposure, but the advertising message may not contain the type of benefit information consumers perceive at that time to be important to their decision. The third is the presence of competing processing goals at the time of advertising exposure (Wright, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Advertising message involvement is not likely to be high if consumers are engaging in conversation, reading or snacking during advertising exposure.

The following two antecedents may either facilitate or hinder advertising message involvement relative to brand response involvement. The first antecedent is the novelty or distinctiveness of the advertising stimuli. Novel stimuli are better attended and more deeply processed than familiar stimuli (Taylor & Fiske, 1978; Eysenck, 1979; Berlyne, 1970). If the novel elements of the advertising stimulus relate to the message, then message processing should be facilitated; it they do not, then message processing is likely to be hindered. The second antecedent is the ability of the communication to evoke a strong emotional response. Stimuli that evoke extreme emotional responses, either positive or negative, are likely to be more efficiently encoded into memory than stimuli that produce little or no arousal (Silk & Vavra, 1974; Bolles, 1988; Mandler, 1984; Nilsson, 1984; Bower, 1981; Anderson, 1983). Again, affect generating stimuli relating to the message should facilitate message encoding; affective stimuli unrelated to the message will distract message processing.

Summary

Advertising message involvement is a primary predictor of the type of information that will be efficiently encoded into memory at the advertising

exposure occasion. When advertising message involvement is at its lowest level, there is little or no cognitive elaboration of message elements. It is likely that affective stimuli will be most attended and most likely to be efficiently encoded into brand memory structures. In the middle of the advertising message involvement continuum, cognitive response activity is likely, but no significant effort is expected to interrelate message information to other information in brand or product class memory structures. As a result, abstractions are likely to be absolute in nature and tied specifically to message content. It is most likely that quality cue type information will be attended. When advertising message involvement is at its highest level, message information will be evaluated in the context of brand and product class schemas and so integrated. Specific performance information is most likely to be attended.

Since accessibility is a prerequisite to the mediation of a piece of information on brand choice, advertising message involvement affects the type of advertising information that is capable of mediating choice at the brand response occasion. However, if accessible advertising information is not perceived to be relevant at the brand response occasion, it is not likely to mediate choice. Therefore, accessibility is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for choice mediation.

Brand response involvement is a primary predictor of the level of information consumers will seek to discriminate brands at the brand response occasion. Most research has studied the effects of brand response involvement in the context of a low-high involvement dichotomy. When brand response involvement is low brand evaluations are expected to be based on effects ranging from simple approach responses created by awareness-based affect or affective associations to the deliberate consideration of choice cues such as a credible spokesperson or global evaluations of the executional elements of advertising. It makes sense that this wide definition of low involvement effects could be further segmented as

Rothschild (1979) recommended and as one might expect given the categories of advertising message involvement that Greenwald and Leavitt (1984) conceptualized. In this case, very low brand response involvement would be characterized by behavioral effects motivated by affective reactions and moderate involvement would be characterized by effects of quality cue type information. High brand response involvement has been consistently linked to the use of specific performance information.

Brand response involvement is an antecedent of advertising message involvement, but it is not the only antecedent. For this reason, there is a real likelihood that advertising message involvement and brand response involvement will not always correspond. Due to the potential of a lack of correspondence and the simple truth that the advertising exposure occasion and the brand response occasion are separate in time and space, the effects of advertising message involvement and brand response involvement need to be modelled separately in models of advertising effectiveness.

Affect and Automaticity

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to discuss the evidence that brand choice behavior can be mediated by holistic affective responses that may be retrieved effortlessly, and independently of their informational sources. Simple affect represents a level of information that other models either ignore or lump together with all non-attribute, non-performance related mediators of brand evaluation. For example, the Elaboration Likelihood Model includes affective responses in its peripheral route, but it also includes deliberate, cognitive processes such as effects

of source credibility (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). Attitude toward the ad research distinguishes between evaluative sources of the construct such as source evaluations and affective sources such as emotional reactions to stimuli (Lutz, 1985).

For purposes of clarity, a distinction must be made among evaluation, attitude and affect. Despite the routine use of all three terms in the literature, there is no clear distinction among the three; they are often used interchangeably (Allen & Madden, 1983; Cohen, 1989). In the context of this thesis, there are substantive differences. To avoid confusion, the three constructs will be defined as follows. An evaluation is a deliberate, conscious appraisal of an event, situation or object. An attitude was previously defined as a deliberately formed brand evaluation. An attitude is one type of evaluation. Evaluations may not involve attitude formation or modification. For example, choice is an evaluation that may precede attitude formation (Ray et al.., 1973; Lastovicka & Bonfield, 1982). Affect is a feeling state (Zajonc, 1980; Bower, 1981). Its encoding or retrieval is not necessarily an outcome of deliberate, conscious cognitive activity. Affect exists independently of attitudes and evaluations. That is, the presence of affect in memory implies neither the presence or absence of an attitude in memory. The presence of affect also neither implies past nor predicts future evaluative activity within the memory structure. An affective response is one source of information that may be used in an evaluation; it is one source of information that may be used to form or modify an attitude, but it is not an attitude or an evaluation.

Evidence will be presented that supports the notion that simple affective responses encoded without elaboration, and retrieved with little or no deliberate effort, can mediate consumer choice behavior. These affective states are capable of mediating behavior without deliberate transformation into semantic propositions

because the inherently rewarding properties of positive affect can motivate approach behavior; similarly the aversive properties of negative affect can motivate avoidance (Nord & Peter, 1980; Skinner, 1974). Two macro processes through which simple affect can become effortlessly linked to brands are the exposure effect and classical conditioning. Evidence suggests that these two processes can function at very low levels of advertising message involvement and brand response involvement; processes requiring the deliberate encoding, retrieval and inputting of higher level information into evaluation rules are not likely to operate at these involvement levels.

Separate Affective and Cognitive Systems?

According to Zajonc (1980), affect and cognition are under the control of separate and partially independent systems that constitute independent sources of information processing. Unlike active cognitive evaluations, affective reactions can occur without extensive perceptual and cognitive encoding, are made with greater confidence, and are made sooner than cognitive processing evaluations. The affective reaction represents a holistic response to the object and the context in which it appears, and can motivate approach behavior.

Other characteristics of responses emanating from the affective processing system include the following (Zajonc, 1980). The response is the first, instinctual response made towards the attitude object. The response is involuntary. The response is effortless. The response is often irrevocable, even after cognitively-based refutation. The response is difficult to justify or explain. This inability to verbalize the source of the affect suggested to Zajonc that the reaction derives from nonverbal channels. He argued that these responses are more appropriately described as an affective reactions or approach (or avoidance) tendencies rather

than an enduring attitudes because they are neither the products of cognitive elaboration or cognitive justification of affective feelings.

Controlled Versus Automatic Processing.

An accumulating body of evidence incorporates many of Zajonc's propositions in the context of information processing theory. Rather than separate processing systems, this literature supposes that affect may reside in brand memory networks and may achieve "spontaneous" retrieval because of the manner in which they are stored in these networks relative to more complex verbal and visual memory representations. A distinction is made between "automatic" and "controlled" information processing as a basis for discriminating the deliberateness by which the informational inputs to attitudinal and choice processes are accessed (Anderson, 1983; Bargh, 1984; Isen, 1984).

Essentially, this literature proposes that affect retrieval is post-cognitive, but not necessarily post-conscious. As Nisbett and Wilson (1977) stated, it is the result of thinking, not the thinking itself that spontaneously appears in consciousness. This perspective is consistent with positions found in the literature on schema matching and categorization (Mandler, 1975; Fiske, 1982; Cohen, 1982). The affective response that follows matching an object in the environment with a category in memory can result from holistic, subconscious cognitive activity or meticulous conscious activity. Both are cognitive, but awareness of cognitions occurs only in the latter scenario.

As it stands, there is no definitive evidence that affect is independent of cognition. The argument may ultimately depend on one's definition of cognition. If one argues that a cognition must be conscious to be labelled a cognition, then Zajonc' perspective that affect can precede cognition is appealing. If one takes the perspective that cognitions operate below the level of consciousness, then Zajonc's

perspective becomes more controversial (Cohen, 1989). The essence of the debate, however, is irrelevant to the theoretical framework presented in this thesis. What is relevant is that simple affective responses can be encoded and retrieved, with little or no deliberate effort, independently of the information that originally evoked this affect.

Controlled information processing. Classic hierarchy of effects perspectives on persuasion tend to view consumers as masters or at least manipulators of their information environment (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961; McGuire, 1968; Ray et al.., 1973). Informational inputs into evaluation processes are assumed to be deliberately considered (or rejected) at the time of information exposure and deliberately used (or discounted) at the time of evaluation (Lutz, 1975, 1977). Information search and information processing are biased by one's prior experiences and limitations, but the retrieval process is consciously directed. Input into the decision process is characterized by the effortful, directed accessing of information into working memory. More recent models tend to associate this type of controlled information processing with high consumer involvement (Batra & Ray, 1985; Petty,Cacioppo.& Schumann, 1983).

Automatic information processing. If information has been habitually associated to a brand concept (e.g., through heavy practice), then the associational pathways between the object and the information may become so strong that the information will come to be "automatically" accessed upon perception of the stimulus object (Posner & Snyder, 1975; Schiffrin & Schneider, 1977; Bargh, 1984; Fazio, 1986). The response is automatic in the sense that it is involuntary and effortless. For example, no conscious effort is required for most adult drivers to interpret the meaning of a red traffic light. A red light means

stop. Perception of the red light can cause one to begin braking without deliberate, conscious evaluation of the situation. As Bargh said (1984, pg. 5), "We will here define automatic processes as those which are under the immediate control of the environment. All that an automatic process requires is the presence of a triggering stimulus configuration; no conscious intervention of any kind is necessary. Theorists concur that conscious processing dominates automatic processing and inhibits it from reaching awareness. Any potential effects of automatic processing are likely to be suppressed by effects of deliberate processing" (Posner & Snyder, 1975; Logan, 1980; Bargh, 1984).

The key discriminating characteristic between automatic and controlled information processing is the degree of conscious control over the information that is accessed into working memory (Posner & Snyder, 1975; Schneider & Schiffrin, 1977; Schiffrin & Schneider, 1977; Bower, 1981; Zajonc, 1980). Posner and Snyder (1975) describe a two step process in the evaluation of a stimulus. First, stimulus identification is generated through the automatic activation of pathways in a well-established memory network containing the stimuli and its habitual associates . It requires neither conscious intention or stimulus awareness to occur, but if attention is at all maintained, the results of this analysis may enter consciousness as identification of the stimulus and its habitual associates (Posner & Snyder, 1975; Zajonc, 1980). For example, upon hearing the name McDonald's, associations such as "hamburgers," "kids," an image of the golden arches or a warm, happy feeling may automatically come to mind without effort. Information retrieved via the automatic processing system may be the only information to enter the evaluation process when consumer brand response involvement is very low (Posner & Snyder, 1975; Bargh, 1984; Isen, 1984).

Second, any subsequent cognitive elaboration of this information, whether it be (1) evaluative as in making evaluative abstractions from accessed affect or evaluative inferences from accessed information; (2) interpretive as in attribute belief formation; or (3) integrative as relating attribute beliefs to a brand attribute cognitive structure, is under the realm of controlled information processing (Schiffrin & Schneider, 1977; Posner & Snyder; Zajonc, 1980; Bargh, 1984). Controlled processing is dynamic, flexible, and adaptable to any situation, but requires effort and is severely constrained by limited processing capacity . After automatic associations to McDonald's have been accessed, if one begins consciously thinking about McDonald's, then more complex memory representations such as, "They have the best fries of any fast food burger restaurant," "I like the Big Mac better than the quarter pounder," or "The McDonald's downtown always has slower service than the one near my home," may be retrieved.

Affect and automatic processing. Automaticity cannot be achieved without extensive practice. The amount of practice required to achieve automaticity is a function of the affective intensity of the brand information to be encoded (Neisser, 1976; Bargh, 1984) and the structural complexity of that information(Anderson, 1983; Rivolli & Anderson, 1985).

Vivid affective information requires less attention to be noticed, and hence less practice to become the product of automatic processing (Neisser, 1976). More importantly, given the same amount of practice, more affective information, positive or negative is more accessible than less affective information. Apparently, affective stimuli generate stronger memory representations at the time of encoding and are less subject to decay than stimuli evoking little or no

affect (Anderson, 1983; Rivolli & Anderson, 1985; Silk & Vavra, 1974; Dutta & Kanungo, 1966, 1972).

Brand information that take less effort to rehearse is more likely to become a product of automatic processing because it is more likely to be fully attended and comprehended at each rehearsal opportunity. The effort required to practice any given association to a brand is a function of the sophistication of the propositional fact (i.e., the number of nodes in the associate) (Anderson, 1983). Evidence indicates a retrieval bias in favor of easily processed, visual or verbal information over more abstract memory representations (Campbell, 1974; Kaplan, 1976; Fiske, Kenny, & Taylor, 1982; Nisbett & Ross, 1980).

Finally, memory representations that are efficiently stored in memory have a greater likelihood of automatic activation because they are less subject to interference effects. As the number of factual associations to a stimulus increases, the probability that activation will spread from the stimulus to any given associate decreases because the size of the memory network increases interference (Rivolli & Anderson, 1985; Hayes-Roth, 1977). In a complex memory representation, only the most efficiently stored associates are likely to be accessed with little or no effort. Simple affect is postulated to be the least complex memory representation (i.e., it may be stored in a single node in memory) (Bower, 1981; Isen, 1984).

Affect, due to its innate ability to generate stronger traces than neutrally valanced information, the relative ease by which it can be encoded and rehearsed, and the efficient manner in which it can be stored in memory structures, may be subject to effects of automatic processing than other types of information. It follows that when brand response involvement is very low, affective responses may be the only information accessed from brand memory. What follows is a discussion of the exposure effect and affective classical conditioning, two processes

by which affect can become linked to a brand in a manner that permits effortless retrieval at a later time.

The Exposure Effect

Pioneered by Zajonc (1968), exposure effect research rests on the empirical fact that repeated exposure to a stimulus enhances the liking of the stimulus. According to Zajonc (1968, pg. 1), "Mere repeated exposure of the individual to a stimulus object enhances his attitude. By mere exposure is meant a condition making the stimulus accessible to the individual's perception." Early empirical evidence supports the conviction that the affect produced by repeated exposure is independent of any deliberate interpretation of the stimulus or the context in which it is presented. Initial experiments manipulated the frequency of meaningless (to American students) Turkish words 1, 2, 5, 10 or 25 times. Follow-up experiments controlled for the possible confounding effects of word pronunciation difficulty, initial word neutrality, and ease of recognition. The frequency-affect relationship consistently has been found to be a linear function of the logarithm of frequency (Zajonc, 1968; Harrison, 1977). A demand effect interpretation was refuted convincingly by Moreland and Zajonc (1976), who used a between subjects design in which subjects were completely unaware of the different levels of stimulus exposure.

Although Zajonc assumed that stimulus familiarity is a likely outcome of repeated exposure, he proposed that it is not a necessary condition to produce the frequency-affect relationship. Causal path analyses were employed to both support and refute this claim (Moreland & Zajonc, 1979; Birnbaum & Mellers, 1979). Wilson (1979) produced more compelling evidence for the mediation of the exposure effect without subjective familiarity. Tones were presented to subjects in one ear while verbal task instructions were presented in the other ear. Subjects

displayed the exposure effect even though they showed no recognition of the tones. His results, however, have not been replicated. In a relatively early study, Stang (1975) found that differential recall of words was necessary for the presence of the exposure effect. Replicatable experimental, not correlational, methodologies are needed to settle the debate. Until that time, this thesis will assume that subjective familiarity mediates the exposure effect.

Stimulus habituation through arousal reduction seems to be the best theoretical explanation of why subjective familiarity should mediate liking (Harrison, 1977; Zajonc, 1968; Berlyne, 1970). According to this perspective, novel stimuli generate excessively high levels of arousal that trigger an avoidance response. Repeated exposure decreases arousal, facilitating stimulus habituation, affect formation, and an approach tendency. From a behavioristic perspective, habituation may represent a negative reinforcement. That is, approach towards a familiar stimulus may not be rewarding in a positive sense, but it may represent an avoidance of pain that could result from approaching other, unfamiliar stimuli (Skinner, 1974).

Besides facilitating the exposure effect, high levels of exposure can also lead to tedium and irritation. These negative effects of exposure serve to flatten the exposure-affect function. Similarly, positive contextual associations to stimuli can steepen the slope of the exposure-affect curve (Burgess & Sales, 1971; Harrison, 1977). Both contextual effects are expected, however, to have a very short duration relative to that of the exposure effect itself. Exposure-generated tedium and irritation typically have occurred when the stimulus presentation method is homogenous or the stimulus is very simple. When the method is heterogenous and/or complex stimuli are used, the effect is generally found (Stang, 1974). The choice of measurement scales can also influence the shape of the frequency-affect relationship. Zajonc (1968) made the distinction between

curiosity and affect. The two have been shown to be uncorrelated (Harrison, 1977). Zajonc hypothesized that scales picking up curiosity feelings will not demonstrate the exposure effect because curiosity declines with exposure, while exposure-based affect increases with exposure. A 1974 study (Zajonc, Crandall, Kail) supported this assertion.

Although more research is needed, there is evidence that illustrates the potential that exposure generated affect in a marketing setting can be a necessary and sufficient condition for brand choice rather than simply a necessary condition as predicted in hierarchy of effects perspectives on persuasion. In one study, "advertisements" consisting solely of Turkish words were placed in a school newspaper. Exposure frequency mediated attitudes toward the words (Zajonc & Rajecki, 1969). Two other studies relate directly to brand choice.

In the first of these studies (Becknell, Wilson, & Baird, 1963) differentially exposed subjects to a series of nonsense syllables. These syllables were subsequently linked to a series of boxes containing nylon stockings. Exposure generated familiarity significantly influenced brand preference and brand choice. In a later study, posters of fictitious candidates were placed about a university campus in varying frequency. No information other than the candidate names and the contested elected position was made available. Students most frequently exposed to the posters voted for the most publicized candidates (Stang, 1974, in Harrison, 1977).

Since the exposure-affect relationship is a linear function of the logarithm of frequency, at first glance it follows that the repetition of extremely familiar stimuli should have little or no marginal impact on stimuli liking because the exposure-affect function will already be its asymptote. The absence of absolute effects on liking with highly familiar stimuli has been substantiated empirically (Harrison, 1977; Berlyne, 1970; Zajonc, 1968). A study by Schick, McGlynn, and

Worlam (1972) best illustrates this finding. A familiar cartoon strip was redrawn to substitute unfamiliar characters, while cartoon content remained unchanged. Familiar cartoons were preferred over unfamiliar cartoons.; unfamiliar cartoons, however, showed increasing humor ratings across exposures, while familiar cartoon ratings remained stable.

In a marketing context this finding indicates that unfamiliar brands will show much greater absolute gains in exposure-based affect than will familiar brands. However, in advertising situations involving familiar brands, the exposure effect may still play a role in influencing brand choice. While the absolute effect of exposure may be small, all things equal, the change relative to competitors may prompt brand choice. For example, Coke and Pepsi are both highly familiar brand names. Despite this, it may be a sound objective for Pepsi to make its brand name relatively more familiar than Coke's. While the absolute change created by exposure may be small, the relative change may influence choice. The fact that first brand awareness is the strongest predictor of subsequent switching to a brand (Axelrod, 1968) supports but does not prove this potential. It should also be noted that in the case of packaged goods, relative package awareness may be as important as relative brand name awareness. Research is needed to resolve these issues.

Affective Classical Conditioning

Affective classical conditioning is a controversial issue. The rationale behind the ability of affective conditioning to influence brand choice is simple. Since positive affect is inherently rewarding (Zajonc, 1980; Skinner, 1974) and can lead to approach (choice) behavior (Clark & Isen, 1982; Finley & Staats, 1968; Gorn, 1982), the conditioning of affect to brands potentially can mediate brand choice judgments without deliberate intervening cognitive activity. Evidence

supporting the conditioning of affect to brands is inconclusive. Evidence supporting the durability of affective conditioning is also lacking.

Much speculation surrounds the ability of advertising generated affective responses to mediate brand evaluation. As stated in a review by Silk and Vavra (1974, pg. 158): "The advertising literature is replete with moralizing, equivocation, and conflicting speculation on the subject of how affective reactions to advertisements are related to the ability of advertising stimuli to achieve their intended commercial purposes." The durability of simple affective reactions to advertising is of great importance to both advertising pretesting professionals and marketing communication strategists (Lutz, MacKenzie, Belch, 1982; Shimp, 1981). If these effects are temporary, then commercial pretesting may show artificially inflated or deflated ad generated brand evaluations. The temporary inflation or depression of attitude may mislead advertisers regarding the true effectiveness of the ad over time. If the effect persists, then these reactions must be considered a potential mediator of brand choice, worthy of advertisers' special attention and cultivation, particularly when minimal cognitive processing is expected on the part of message receivers.

It is clear from observing the highly affective appeals in advertising, packaging and point-of-purchase displays, that marketing practitioners knowingly or unknowingly apply the classical conditioning paradigm. Music, sex, fun-in-the-sun, mood scenes, etc. are consistently paired with products through both advertising and packaging (Nord & Peter, 1980; McSweeney & Bierley, 1984, Kroeber-Riel, 1984).

Principles of classical conditioning were ignored in academic circles for many years, mainly because of its association with anti-mentalistic explanations of human behavior. Indeed in marketing, it can be strongly argued that the advent of the information processing paradigm inhibited any consideration of classical

conditioning as a persuasive tool due to its linkage with radical behaviorism. Ross and Ross (1975) argue that classical conditioning has been misrepresented and should be considered a basic facilitator of learning and memory. In the last several years, this view has been bolstered by the advent of network models of memory and the spreading activation principle of information retrieval. This new perspective on learning and memory predicts affective classical conditioning type effects via the automatic (effortless) cued activation of affective nodes in memory (Anderson, 1983; Bower, 1981; Posner & Solso, 1975; Schiffrin & Scheider, 1977; Anderson & Reder, 1984; Bargh, 1984) and permits the integration of the classical conditioning paradigm into the information processing paradigm. The notion that affect can become automatically associated to a brand can also be postulated in the context of both schema (Mandler, 1982) and categorization (Fiske, 1981; Cohen, 1982) theories.

Integrated into the information processing paradigm, classical conditioning should be viewed as a methodology that facilitates the cued automatic retrieval of affect (i.e., the unconditioned stimulus) that has been systematically associated to a given brand (i.e., the conditioned stimulus). Both the behavioristic and automatic information processing paradigms assert that highly repeated explicit associations of an affect-inducing stimulus to a brand can lead to the effortless retrieval of that affect upon perception of the brand stimulus. Both also predict that the retrieved affect can be "free-floating," that is, not explicitly linked to its informational source at the time it is retrieved (e.g., the consumer need not remember that the retrieved affect was caused by an advertisement). Finally, both perspectives predict that the strength of the affective association is a function of the intensity of the affective stimulus and the number of times it is paired with the brand (Anderson, 1983; Anderson & Reder, 1979; Bargh, 1984;

Ross & Ross, 1975; Nord & Peter, 1982; McSweeney & Bierly, 1984, 1985; Kroeber-Riel, 1984).

Early research on CC effects on human behavior dealt with the conditioning of behaviors in the autonomic nervous system. Several American and Russian experiments have shown that semantic meaning can become a conditioned stimulus for physiological functions such as salivation, sweating and blood vessel constriction (Razran, 1971; Staddon, 1975; Hearst, 1975). Other empirical efforts demonstrated conditioning effects with emotional (Ross & Ross, 1976; Staats & Staats, 1962) and verbal (Staats, 1969; Ross & Ross, 1976; Yavuz & Bousfield, 1959) stimuli.

Research by Staats and Staats (1957, 1958) suggested that attitudes towards neutral words could be conditioned by pairing them with words that carried affective meaning. These seminal studies triggered a long-running controversy in psychology as to whether experimentally induced CC type effects on human beings represented true CC effects or experimental demand effects. At one extreme, there was advocacy for the position that CC effects can occur in humans without any awareness that the conditioning took place (Staats, 1969). At the other extreme, theorists argued that CC effects were experimental demand effects. Research by these advocates reported that awareness of the CS-UCS contingency was required for conditioning to occur (Page, 1969; Cohen, 1964). There appears to be three problems with using past "disconfirming" research to attack the feasibility of affective classical conditioning. First, these studies never associated affect to the conditioned stimuli, they associated "symbolic references" to affect (Zanna, Kiesler, & Pilkonis, 1970; O'Donnel & Brown, 1973; Insko & Oakes, 1966). That is, words with affective connotations (e.g., beautiful, ugly) were associated to neutral words, not the affect evoked by beautiful or ugly objects. As a result affective associations were weak or nonexistent and awareness of the

UCS-CS relationship was probably necessary to allow subjects to make inferences regarding the neutral words.

Second, the conditioning procedure in the "disconfirming" studies was very complex, as was the process in the original Staats and Staats (1957, 1958) research (Page, 1969; Cohen, 1964). There were many CS-US combinations being employed; research involved the simultaneous "conditioning" of dozens of words. Simpler, single-cue conditioning processes (i.e., conditioning experiments where a single CS and US are paired) involving emotional responses have been found reliably without subject awareness (Ross & Ross, 1975).

Third, there was no delay between the conditioning process and the awareness measurements. This suggests that the failure for conditioning to occur without CS-US awareness in earlier studies may reflect an attentional problem during the conditioning process, not a need for awareness (See Page, 1969). Staats (1969) and Ross and Ross (1975) assert that when complex conditioning occurs, the attention required to facilitate conditioning necessarily leads to awareness of the CS-US relationship. After a delay, however, this awareness may fade without extinction of the conditioned effect. Research by Yavuz and Bousfield (1959), which incorporated a delay and found conditioning of verbal stimuli without awareness, supports this assertion.

A distinction must be made between contingency awareness and demand awareness. The former should never be used as evidence of the latter. As stated by Petty and Cacioppo (1981, p. 46): "It is important to note that once the demand awareness problem can be ruled out, contingency awareness per se does not rule out a classical conditioning explanation for attitude change...people may be able to to express the contingency but nevertheless have their attitudes altered by the association of the attitude object with the US." A carefully controlled study conducted by Zanna, Kiesler and Pilkonis (1970) controlled for demand effects by

using an elaborate cover story and multiple experimental settings to test for conditioning effects. Marketing experiments that have used a single-cue conditioning process and affective stimuli have reported results highly consistent with an affective classical conditioning hypothesis (Kroeber-Riel, 1984; Gorn, 1982; Allen & Madden, 1983; McSweeny & Bierly, 1985).

Kroeber-Riel (1984) reported the results of advertising research that conditioned emotional responses to a brand of soap. Emotional stimuli, pretested for an absence of informational content, were put in commercials with and without informational support. The brand name, Hoba, was pretested for neutral emotional associations. Subjects were exposed to a series of slide advertisements that paired emotional visuals with soap. Each slide was exposed for five seconds. Twenty-four hours after the final conditioning period, 30 repetitions distributed across 10 days, rating scale and physiological measures of arousal to the conditioned product revealed significant, positive shifts. Since physiological measures are involuntary, both demand effects and deliberate inference-making based on advertising content are highly unlikely explanations of the experimental results. The presence of textual information did not prevent conditioning.

Using a simpler experimental design, Gorn (1982) also produced results consistent with a classical conditioning perspective. In the first of two experiments, colored pens were associated with music pretested for positive and negative affective qualities. Slides of a colored pen was exposed for one minute to subjects while either the positive or negative music played in the background. After the presentation, subjects were asked to pick either the treatment pen or a control pen, which varied only in color. Choice behavior varied significantly in the expected direction. The pen color associated to positive music was chosen more often than the control; the pen associated to negative music was chosen less often than the control. Reported cognitive response activity during message exposure

was minimal. Debriefing indicated no demand characteristics. In a second study, subjects were exposed to two "advertisements." The first was the slide of a pen accompanied by positive background music; the second was the slide of a pen accompanied by attribute information. The advertised pens differed only by color. Advertisements were exposed to subjects for one minute The author manipulated brand response involvement by informing half the subjects they would be asked to make a decision regarding the selection of pens after the experiment; the other half were told nothing. Subjects in the high involvement condition were significantly more likely to choose the pen associated with the performance information. Subjects in the low involvement condition were significantly more likely to choose the pen associated with the music.

Allen and Madden (1985) performed a partial replication and extension of the Gorn (1982) study. Humor was used rather than music to evoke affect. A comedy segment involving Bill Cosby became the positive affect treatment; a segment with Red Foxx was the negative condition. Subjects were processed individually rather than in groups. A more systematic post-experimental inquiry was used to test for demand effects. Subjects were told they would be evaluating elements of a radio advertising campaign to promote a pen. They listened to one of the two segments while either a green or black pen was exposed on a slide. The pens in the positive and the negative affect conditions were chosen more frequently than the control pen; differences in the positive condition were significant, differences in the negative condition were not significant. The absence of a significant difference in choice between the positive and negative conditions was taken by the authors as evidence against affective classical conditioning. Inspection of the data, however, reveals that both the Bill Cosby and Red Foxx treatments were evaluated positively. The average rating on a 7 point scale across nine semantic differential measures was 2.3 for the Cosby

segment and 3.3 for the Foxx segment. The absence of a positive and negative conditioning effects in the experiment open the results to interpretations other than conditioning, notably the exposure effect, but these results do not contradict a conditioning hypothesis.

The Allen and Madden Study (1985) also included a measure of post-choice loyalty. Subjects were given the opportunity of trading their chosen pen for money. First, they were offered 25 cents. If they refused, they were offered 50 cents. Significantly more subjects sold the pen back to experimenters in the negative affect (6.7%) than the positive affect (26.7%) condition. The authors hypothesized that the absence of positive conditioning, but the presence of a loyalty effect may have been caused by mood effects on the higher level cognitive activity prompted by the "buy-back" decision task. As the authors stated, "The mood position holds that feelings do not transfer automatically and directly between stimuli, but rather influence judgements and behavior by prompting and biasing cognitive activity" (Allen & Madden, 1985; pg - 312). There is little doubt that mood effects on information retrieval and the interpretation of ambiguous stimuli present a strong potential confound to conditioning explanations (Bower, 1981; Clark & Isen, 1982; Isen, 1984). Future empirical work must control for the potential higher level mood effects, or better yet, directly pit direct versus indirect effects of affect against each other. However, there is no evidence that mood effects mediated results in this particular experiment. First, there was no positive or negative performance information available for either product, nor were there any real differences between pen alternatives other than color. So, a retrieval bias created by salient affect is not likely. Second, the stimuli were not truly ambiguous. Bill Cosby was associated to one; Red Foxx was associated to the other. If the buy-back task motivated higher level cognitive activity, it is possible that the experimental effects were

caused by the relative appeal and imagery of the two comedians. This explanation appears more valid than the mood explanation, particularly since both comedians' comedy segments were evaluated positively (i.e., there should be no major difference in mood effects).

From a technical procedural point of view, Gorn (1982), Kroeber-Riel (1980) and Allen and Madden (1985) all violated certain assumptions about the requirements for conditioning. All three experiments simultaneously presented the CS and US. Pavlov originally mandated that the CS must precede the US for conditioning to occur (Pavlov, 1928). However, this requirement has been challenged (See Rescorla, 1967). Gorn (1982) and Allen and Madden (1985) also based conditioning on a single advertising exposure. Although this violates widely held assumptions behind conditioning, effects have been achieved after single exposures (McSweeney & Bierley, 1984). However as Allen and Madden (1983 p. 28) commented, "It is conceivable that repeated pairings become less important when the duration of the pairing is lengthened, as long as the receiver's attention is fixed on both the US and CS." Exposure effect research supports this potential by suggesting that it is the duration of attention, not the number of repetitions, that might drive familiarity based liking. Crandall (1972) prolonged a single exposure period to 50 minutes and found the frequency-affect relationship to asymptote at two exposures. Zajonc, Crandall and Kail (1974) shortened the exposure time to a fraction of a second and did not achieve a strong exposure effect until after 243 exposures (exposure sequence was 3, 9, 27, 81, 243). Success without heavy repetition sequences in these experiments may have been possible due to the brief delay between exposure and measurement (affect was still "hot"). Also, classic CC technologies were developed with animals, not humans. The potential superiority of human versus animal encoding of affective responses

need be considered (e.g., fewer repetitions are required to gain short term effect, particularly in the absence of a delay).

Technical and procedural criticisms of the marketing related classical conditioning literature are valid in the sense they point out inconsistencies with a pure classical conditioning paradigm. However, such critiques do not necessarily dispel the potential that simple affective reactions to stimuli were directly mediating evaluation without deliberate, intervening cognitive activity, or that these affective reactions were a product of automatic processing. These are the central issues from the point of view of this thesis.

Bierley and McSweeney (1985) designed a study that neither violated the principles of contiguity (i.e., CS presentation prior to UCS presentation) or reinforcement (i.e., multiple repetitions). Subjects were exposed to a set of 84 red, blue and yellow geometric figures. One figure was always followed by positively charged music, one figure was followed by the music half of the time, and one figure was never followed by the music. The colors linked to each condition were rotated. Conditioning effects were observed. As predicted, positive effects were strongest when the stimuli were always followed by music and weakest with the stimuli never followed by music. The fact that subjects were asked to mentally predict the onset of music after each exposure raised the potential of a demand effect, but no such evidence was indicated in post-experimental interviews. Although awareness was not a precondition for conditioning, it did strengthen the relationship.

The experimental design also permitted a test of the explanation that CC results are actually examples of the exposure effect. If such was the case, then parallel increases in evaluation would be expected in all three conditions. No such increases transpired, so the results support a conditioning hypothesis and reject a familiarity hypothesis. The Gorn (1982) study results also contradicted

a familiarity hypothesis since subjects in the negative affect treatment chose the associated pen less frequently than the control pen.

Finally, although affect transfer was not explicitly the subject of the experiment, Milliman (1978) reported a powerful behavioral effect of classically conditioned motor responses to music. Slow or fast music was played in several supermarkets (supermarkets were matched on the basis of average sales) over a period of weeks. Slow tempo music resulted in a slower in-store walking/browsing pace than fast tempo music. Incredibly, store sales were an average of 38% higher in the slow tempo stores than the fast tempo stores. It is likely, then, that the music triggered a conditioned motor response in subjects (fast or slow pace) which affected the perception of store stimuli. Subjects were not only completely unaware of any effect of music on their behavior, a majority of subjects (64%) could not confidently remember if the supermarkets were even playing music. Milliman (1986) produced similar results in a study that measured the effect of background music on restaurant behavior. Subjects in the fast tempo music spent less time and money in the restaurant than people in the slow tempo condition.

The Relative Efficacy of "Exposure" and "Conditioned" Liking

Effects of affect automatically retrieved via the exposure effect and affective classical conditioning may combine to exert a total effect on behavior. In his original "mere" exposure monograph, Zajonc (1968) predicted the exposure effect could be moderated by explicit positive or negative associations to the stimulus. Direct, positive associations to the stimulus were thought to accelerate the habituation process and, thus, steepen the slope of the exposure-affect function. Direct, negative associations were expected to attenuate the habituation process and thus flatten the slope of the exposure-affect function. Only in the absence of

"reward (positive associations) or punishment (negative associations)" was a pure effect predicted.

These theoretical statements are empirically supported (Burgess & Sales, 1971; Zajonc, Markus, & Wilson, 1974; Harrison, 1977). In these studies, the most repeated stimuli were most affected by the paired associates, which is, of course, consistent with classical conditioning theory. The fact that direct, positive associations generally steepened the frequency-affect slope relative to a pure exposure effect, while negative associations flattened the slope rather than evoking a negatively sloped function, suggests that the exposure effect and affect transfer constitute independent sources of brand affect that may be added together to arrive at an overall affective response. To avoid potential confoundings, future studies must control for this likelihood.

The evidence to date indicates that effects of familiarity are more durable than classical conditioning type effects. Effects of brand name familiarity should be easier to encode and maintain, because no explicit link between affect generating stimuli and the brand name or package need be formed. The affect resides within the brand name itself. Classical conditioning type effects require both a strong affective source and an effective linkage to the brand. Unlike affective classical conditioning, effects of familiarity require only recognition of the brand name, not the automatic recall of affective associates to the brand name. Since recall failures occur much sooner than recognition failures (Crowder, 1976; Glass, Holyoak & Santa, 1979), the impact of brand name familiarity should dissipate more slowly than the impact of any mediating component of brand attitude that requires cued or free recall. As the evidence below suggests, successful linkages may decay quickly.

A debate regarding the role of affect and evaluation sheds some light on the issue. In their review on affect and evaluation, Silk and Vavra (1974) discussed

two points of view: The Law of Extremes and the Superiority of the Pleasant hypothesis. The Law of Extremes is a memory-based perspective. The Superiority of the Pleasant hypothesis is an associational perspective. The Law of Extremes proposes that affective intensity is more important than affective direction. It.predicted a J-shaped affect-liking function because intense emotional stimuli were expected to facilitate attention and long term memory of the advertising message relative to unemotional stimuli. The key assumption is that affective associations between the ad and the brand quickly become disassociated. The implication of this thesis is that an irritating ad is more effective than a neutral ad because the brand name and message are remembered long after the negative affect accompanying the ad has been dissociated from the brand. The J-shape is expected rather than a U-shaped function because residual affective associations are expected to benefit positive ads and depress negative ads. The Superiority of the Pleasant hypothesis advances a positively sloped, monotonic relationship between ad affect and brand liking. Supporters of this thesis argued that ad affect transfers directly to the brand and that positively valenced ads have superior memorability than negatively valanced ads. The implication of this position is that positive ads are universally more effective than negative ads. The dissociation hypothesis is rejected.

In their attempt to reconcile the competing viewpoints, Silk and Vavra (1974) maintained that affect becomes disassociated from the brand over time, but that increased familiarity with the brand brought about by advertising is much more permanent. As a result, the Superiority of the Pleasant hypothesis was expected to dominate evaluation immediately after exposure, while the Law of Extremes was expected to work after a time delay. It follows from this point of view that immediately after exposure, the likelihood of effects of associational affect should be maximized. Any associated affect is at its "hottest" and is most

linked to the brand at this time. As the interval between ad exposure and brand evaluation increases, however, affective associations cool and the probability that the affect remains spontaneously associated with the brand rapidly decreases. The superior brand name memory generated by intense affective stimuli, however, does not dissipate quickly relative to the rate of affect dissociation. Thus, the exposure effect dominates affect transfer after a delay.

Moore and Hutchinson (1983,1985) report results that support the point of view that the exposure effect is more durable than affect transfer. Subjects were exposed to positively and negatively valanced stimuli. Evaluative reactions to the advertised brands were taken two and seven days after exposure. In a regression analysis, evaluations of the advertising mediated brand liking as strongly as ratings of subjective brand familiarity two days after advertising exposure. Brand liking was a linear function of the valence of the affective reactions to the advertisements. Brands in well-liked advertisements were liked significantly more than brands in unliked advertising. After seven days, however, the mediating strength of attitude toward the ad dropped close to nonsignificance, while the relative mediating strength of familiarity reactions increased.

Summary

Evidence has been presented that supports the proposition that pure affective reactions to stimuli represent a third level of information, beyond quality cue or relative performance information, that is capable of directly mediating brand choice. Simple affective reactions can be efficiently encoded and retrieved with little or no deliberate cognitive effort. They are also as or more likely to become a product of automatic retrieval than other types of information (Zajonc, 1980; Bower, 1981; Bargh, 1984). The natural reinforcing properties of affect can lead to behavioral effects with little or no deliberate intervening cognitive activity

(Skinner, 1974; Nord & Peter, 1980; Kroeber-Riel, 1979). Since affect does not require any cognitive transformation in order for the evaluative process to operate, cognitive elaboration adds no more facilitating power than simple rehearsal effects. Two processes by which simple affect can become associated to brands are the exposure effect and affective classical conditioning. The weight of the evidence indicates that both processes can directly mediate choice. However, there is still considerable debate, particularly in the case of classical conditioning (Allen & Madden, 1985; Bierley & McSweeney, 1984; Cohen, 1989?). Cognitive elaboration at the time of encoding or retrieval is expected to inhibit both the exposure effect (Hasher & Zacks, 1984; Zajonc, 1968, 1980; Obermiller, 1985) and affective classical conditioning (Ross & Ross, 1975; Bargh, 1984; Kroeber-Riel, 1984). Direct effects of retrieved affect on choice are expected only when brand response involvement is very low (Batra & Ray, 1981; Lutz, 1985; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). As involvement increases, affective reactions potentially can bias the retrieval and interpretation of higher level information, but not directly mediate evaluation (Bower, 1981; Isen, 1984; Garder, 1985).

Intervening Theoretical Constructs

Introduction

Theoretical constructs, most notably brand attribute cognitive structure and attitude toward the ad, are postulated to capture the effects of deliberate (e.g., cognitive elaboration) and nondeliberate cognitive (e.g., automatic processing) processes and bring them one step closer to overt behavior (Lutz & Swasy, 1977; Lutz, 1985; Mitchell & Olson, 1981). This perspective presumes that these constructs mediate brand attitudes which in turn mediate purchase intentions

and choice behavior. In essence, these constructs add a step in a causal chain that may (or may not) be initiated by cognitive response activity.

Historically, most conceptualizations of advertising effects presumed that brand evaluations were mediated by the effortful analysis of performance-related information and, ultimately, the formation of performance related beliefs about the brand (Lavidge & Steiner, 1961; McGuire, 1968). These effects more recently have been conceptualized as working through a construct that may be termed brand attribute cognitive structure (Lutz, 1975, 1977; Lutz & Swasy, 1977, Toy, 1982).

In recent years, mounting evidence has amended this traditional view to reflect the evaluative implications of constructs that are unrelated to specific aspects of brand performance (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Lutz, 1985). Attitude toward the ad is the theoretical construct that has received the most attention in the advertising effects literature. Another construct, brand name familiarity, has also been studied (Baker et al.., 1986; Batra & Ray, 1985).

The introduction of these new constructs, particularly attitude toward the ad (AAD), has contributed to the advertising effects literature. Their study has accelerated the "reintroduction" of affect into models of advertising-generated attitude formation after years of focus on attribute based models (See Wilkie & Pessemier, 1973 & Ryan & Bonfield, 1980). More specifically, the ability of the AAD construct to significantly mediate brand attitude formation, after the effects of brand attribute cognitive structure are removed, casts doubt on the adequacy of brand attribute-based models of attitude formation, particularly in low involvement situations (Mitchell & Olson, 1981).

Investigation of these constructs has also improved the understanding of the different ways that executional elements of an advertisement can influence brand attitude formation (e.g., classical conditioning, source effects, the exposure effect)

and how the antecedents of advertising effects vary with involvement (Lutz, 1985).

The following section examines the theoretical and empirical support for these constructs, particularly attitude toward the ad and brand attribute cognitive structure. Methodological problems involving the research will also be discussed.

Brand Attribute Cognitive Structure

Cognitive Structure(CS) is an informational construct in the sense that any brand related affect (i.e., liking) generated through it is, by definition, derived from a series of performance related beliefs. Cognitive structure refers to the bundle of utilitarian and hedonic beliefs associated to any given brand. Utilitarian beliefs relate to a brand's performance characteristics (e.g., an automobile's styling, comfort, handling, gas mileage, etc.). Hedonic beliefs relate to a brand's symbolic meaning, its influence on lifestyle, self-image perceptions, and reference group identification (e.g., an automobile's ability to promote an upscale lifestyle, free-spiritedness, reference group identification. etc.) (Hirschmann & Holbrook, 1982).

Theoretically, the notion that specific brand beliefs mediate global brand evaluation grew from the work of Rosenberg (1956) and Fishbein (1963, 1967). Their multi-attribute summation models provide a mechanism by which brand beliefs are converted into brand attitudes and purchase intentions. In the 1970s, these models exploded in popularity in consumer research; one reason for this was their consistency with the "hyper-cognitive" information processing perspective of the 1970s (Anderson, 1978; Bettman, 1979). Research has established the validity of theoretical links among brand cognitions, brand attribute beliefs, and attitudes (Lutz, 1975, 1977; Lutz & Swasy, 1977; Toy, 1982) and the process

validity of the multiattribute summation model (Bettman, Capon, & Lutz, 1974).

Advertising effects mediated through cognitive structure are the product of deliberate evaluation processes. Considerable effort is required to encode and transform advertising message information into brand-related beliefs and to store these beliefs in memory for later use (Lutz & Swasy, 1977). A cognitive structure based persuasion process is roughly equivalent to what others have termed central route processing (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983), systematic information processing (Chaiken, 1989), and higher order attitude formation (Smith & Swinyard, 1982). Within the context of the Relevance-Accessibility Model, it most closely corresponds to the effects of relative performance information.

The production of cognitive responses is an integral element of cognitive structure mediated brand evaluation. The success of cognitive structure based persuasion in an advertising scenario requires (1) sufficient consumer motivation to facilitate message comprehension and message elaboration and (2) a level of message argument cogency that facilitates message acceptance (i.e., positive cognitive responses) as opposed to message rejection (i.e., negative cognitive responses) (Wright, 1973, 1980; Lutz & Swasy, 1977; Greenwald, 1968; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Wright, 1973, 1980).

Although the basic cognitive requirements of CS mediated brand judgments are fairly well accepted, countless specific compensatory or non-compensatory processes may follow from this level of cognitive activity (Bettman, 1979; Bettman & Park, 1980; Biehal & Chakravarti, 1986). If compensatory, attribute beliefs may be integrated into an overall evaluative reaction, via a number of multiplicative, additive, or hybrid processes (Bettman, Lutz, & Capon, 1974; Anderson, 1978; Wilkie & Pessemier, 1973). If noncompensatory, any one of several decision rules may be implemented to derive brand evaluations (Bettman,

1979), or several rules may be combined in piecemeal fashion (Bettman & Park, 1980; Biehal & Chakravarti, 1986). Empirical methodologies are currently limited in their ability to distinguish the validity of alternative cognitive structure models. Available data "fit" multiple models (Lynch & Srull, 1982). Until methods improve, the ability to identify the precise mechanisms behind cognitive structure mediation is limited.

Although measures of brand attribute cognitive structure can account for a significant portion of the relative attitude variance towards brands, other simpler attitude predictors perform equally well or better (Kraft, Granbois & Summers, 1973; Wilkie & Pessemier, 1973). The Constant Sum Scale and First Brand Awareness measure are especially reliable choice predictors (Axelrod, 1968; Clancy & Ostlund, 1976). Lutz (1975. 1977) demonstrated that the weakest link in the causal chain, beginning with message exposure and ending in behavior (exposure--->beliefs--->cognitive structure--->attitude--->intentions) was between cognitive structure, as measured by a multi-attribute summation model, and attitude toward purchase. This weak link opened the door for the introduction of new theoretical constructs to augment the effects of brand attribute cognitive structure.

Attitude Toward the Ad

The understanding that executional elements of advertising are capable of evoking affective and evaluative reactions wholly or partially independent of utilitarian or hedonic beliefs was a well known fact well before the introduction of attitude toward the ad into the consumer research literature (Wells, McConville, & Leavitt, 1971; Silk & Vavra, 1974; Schlinger, 1979). The formal construct, however, helped rekindle interest in modelling the impact of non-message

elements of advertising and provided a quantifiable means to assess to the relative contribution of these elements.

The attitude toward the ad (AAD) construct embraces a wide array of affective reactions, all of which are asserted to be capable of influencing brand evaluation (Lutz, 1985; Baker, 1985). Lutz (1985) defines the construct as, "A predisposition to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular advertising stimulus during a particular exposure occasion."

Lutz (1985) identified five first order antecedents of attitude toward the ad: ad credibility, ad perceptions, attitude toward the advertiser, attitude toward advertising and mood. Within the context of the RAM, these antecedents include both quality cue level (e.g., ad credibility) and affect level (e.g., mood) information. He also postulated that effects of attitude toward the ad are a function of a number of factors, most notably advertising message involvement, but also advertisement distinctiveness. When advertising message involvement is high and the advertisement is not distinctive executionally, Lutz predicts that evaluative reactions to advertising are <u>not</u> likely to directly mediate brand attitude, but may indirectly mediate brand attitude by facilitating the acceptance or rejection of performance related message arguments. In this scenario the cognitive antecedents of the construct are predicted to drive AAD effects. The affective antecedents of AAD are expected to be inconsequential.

When advertising message involvement is high and the ad is distinctive, or in an advertising pretest situation where consumers are instructed to evaluate the ad, Lutz predicts a "dual mode processing" effect of AAD, otherwise known as the dual mediation hypothesis (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986). In this scenario, AAD is expected to have a direct effect on brand attitude and an indirect effect by facilitating or inhibiting the acceptance of message arguments. Both effects are again expected to be driven by the evaluative antecedents of the

construct. The direct effect of AAD is expected to occur when the construct's cognitive sources are used to generate simple judgmental inferences about the brand (e.g., "good ad"--->"good brand"; "credible source"--->"credible brand"). By definition, this process requires conscious recognition that the reaction towards the ad is guiding reaction towards the brand (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Lutz, 1985). Brand evaluation mediated by evaluative sources of AAD requires no more than a single inference (e.g., good ad--->good brand).

When advertising message involvement is "low," but the advertisement is distinctive or an advertising pretest is imposed where subjects are asked to pay some, but not total, attention to advertisements (See below, Mitchell, Gardner & Russo, 1985; Park & Young, 1986), then the direct, deliberate effect of the cognitive sources of AAD is expected to occur, but not the indirect effect through cognitive structure. It may be argued that the level of advertising message involvement in this scenario is more akin to Greenwald & Leavitt's (1984) comprehension level processing (what the RAM describes as moderate advertising message involvement) rather than what Lutz (1985) terms low involvement.

When advertising message involvement is truly low, Lutz predicts a direct mediation of attitude toward the ad on brand attitude driven by the more purely affective antecedents of the construct. In this scenario, simple affective reactions to advertising transfer to the brand without effortful processing of the advertising message. The operative process is similar to affective classical conditioning as described earlier in this chapter. Little deliberate cognitive activity is required to encode (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984; McSweeney & Bierly, 1985; Posner & Snyder, 1975; Zajonc, 1980) retrieve (Isen, 1984; Bower, 1981; Zajonc & Markus, 1982; Bower, 1981) or translate the affect into a behavioral response (Gorn, 1983; Zajonc, 1980; Skinner, 1974).

The empirical evidence presented below is generally consistent with the assertions of Lutz (1985). Much of the empirical support for dual-mode processing, however, may be a direct result of the experimental methodologies employed in the research.

Several studies linked evaluative sources of the AAD construct, notably credibility, to brand evaluation well before the construct's formal introduction into the literature. Holbrook (1978) factor analyzed ten evaluative scales used to rate a persuasive message into three factors: credibility, enjoyment, and confidence. After the effect of brand attribute cognitive structure had been controlled for statistically, all three factors continued to significantly mediate product evaluation. While Holbrook did not propose that these factors comprised an attitude toward the ad construct, many of the evaluative scales employed have been used in subsequent AAD research. Using a cognitive response methodology, Wright (1973) found source derogation to be a significant mediator of brand attitudes, but only when extensive message processing occurred. Using a similar methodology, Sternthal, Dholakia, and Leavitt (1978) reported that cognitive responses relating to the source of a persuasive message directly mediated attitude formation after effects of attribute beliefs were statistically controlled.

Mitchell and Olson (1981) introduced the attitude toward the ad construct into the marketing literature, empirically demonstrating that affective reactions to advertisements significantly mediated brand attitude after the evaluative effects of advertising-generated brand beliefs on brand attitude were statistically removed. Other research has shown significant direct effects of AAD on brand attitude and purchase intention using covariate analysis or structural modelling type analytic procedures (Shimp, 1981; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989; Moore & Hutchinson 1983, 1985; Batra & Ray, 1985; Baker, 1985; Gresham & Shimp, 1985).

Several studies have explored the effects of involvement on the relative contribution of attitude toward the ad and brand attribute cognitive structure on brand attitude formation. Lutz, MacKenzie, and Belch (1982) demonstrated a dominant effect of AAD over CS even for subjects who reported they were highly involved during their brand evaluations. At that time, the authors speculated that the dominant effect of AAD may have been due to the relative superiority of the experimental measure of ad cognitions over the measure of brand cognitions, or the likelihood that consumer low involvement at the time of advertising exposure made it.difficult, if not impossible, for consumers to retrieve performance related information during the brand evaluation phase of the experiment. Later, however, when this finding was replicated in other research (see below), the dual-mediation hypothesis was introduced.

A series of experiments examined the effects of message processing involvement on attitude toward the ad and brand attribute cognitive structure mediation (Park & Young, 1986; Gardner, 1986; Gardner, Mitchell, & Russo, 1985). In each of these experiments, subjects were either directed to process the contents of the advertising message (i.e., message arguments) or to focus attention on executional elements of the ad (i.e., advertising background visuals, announcers, music, etc.). The former manipulation was termed brand processing, the latter nonbrand processing. All these researchers reported similar results. In the nonbrand processing condition, brand evaluation was dominated by attitude toward the ad; cognitive response and cognitive structure measures were generally nonsignificant predictors of brand attitude and purchase intention. In the brand processing condition, evaluation was a direct function of both AAD and CS.

There were no measures in these experiments that directly supported the assertion that cognitive rather than affective sources of AAD mediated brand evaluations. However, even in the "low" involvement condition, processing

manipulations directed consumers to effortfully analyze the executional characteristics of the experimental advertisements. Given these directions, it follows that executional elements were evaluatively judged, not passively processed in terms of their affect evoking qualities. If this is the case, it follows that advertising credibility, believability, irritability, etc. drove the strong AAD effects.

The dual mediation hypothesis (Lutz, 1985, MacKenzie, Lutz, & Belch, 1986) is also consistent with the research reported above. It asserts that AAD typically exerts both direct and indirect effects on brand response. Using LISREL, the authors tested several structural models of the mediating role of the relationship between ad cognitions, brand cognitions, attitude toward the ad, brand attitude and purchase intention. The model that best fit the data, the dual mediation hypothesis, demonstrated simultaneous direct effects of AAD and brand cognitions on brand attitudes and an indirect effect of AAD on brand attitude through brand cognitions.

These results contradicted predictions made by the Elaboration Likelihood Model of persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). According to the ELM, peripheral effects should not significantly influence brand evaluation when consumers are highly involved during advertising message reception. Contrary to this proposition, the research reported above strongly suggests that peripheral effects (i.e., AAD effects) exert a strong impact on brand response when consumers are processing advertisements in a highly involved manner (i.e., the brand processing condition). Gardner (1986) concluded that central route effects may supplement rather than dominate peripheral effects when consumers are highly involved and that the ELM model must be modified to embrace this notion.

The success of the dual mediation hypothesis in the MacKenzie et al.. (1986) research and its apparent support in several other experiments (e.g., Gardner, Mitchell & Russo, 1985) must be tempered by several methodological considerations. First, a serious drawback to much of the AAD research is the lack of experimental manipulation of the AAD construct. Regardless of the sophistication of correlational analyses such as LISREL, causal assertions require experimental manipulation (Birnbaum & Mellers, 1979).

Second, there is a potential that AAD was in fact a surrogate measure for unmeasured attribute beliefs, particularly hedonic beliefs, that advertising execution elements are capable of generating (Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Lutz, MacKenzie, & Belch, 1982; Park & Young, 1986). In MacKenzie et al..(1986), the fact that the brand cognitions - brand attitude relationship dropped to nonsignificance whenever the attitude toward the ad - brand attitude link was included in the model suggests that AAD measures did capture more than intended. Complete measures of cognitive structure, not just measures relating to attributes discussed in message arguments, including hedonic and utilitarian beliefs, are needed to minimize this possibility. Given, however, that measures of cognitive structure are imperfect representations of how consumers synthesize attribute beliefs (Lynch & Srull, 1982), even this precaution cannot eliminate this potential. The only way to truly eliminate this competing explanation is to manipulate AAD without manipulating cognitive structure This is no easy task (See Baker, 1985; Gresham & Shimp, 1985). None of the reported studies attempted to develop an exhaustive set of utilitarian and hedonic beliefs that may have been created or modified by experimental advertising. When used, cognitive structure measures were limited to a small predetermined set of attributes. Cognitive response measures cannot be depended on to capture the entire range of attributes considered at the time of evaluation (Lutz & Swasy, 1977; Toy, 1982).

Third, the correlation between attitude toward the ad and brand attitude may be a measurement artifact. Measures of AAD and brand attitude were similar in all of the aforementioned experiments. Also, in each experiment, the advertisement was the only piece of information on which a brand attitude could be based. Significant mediating effects of AAD on brand attitude may be at least partially due to the similarity between measures of AAD and measures of brand attitude (Madden, Dillon & Twible, 1985). Madden et al.. (1985) state that method variance is most likely to damage the validity of AAD research when AAD is not experimentally manipulated, the affective intensity of advertisements is weak, and affective and attribute arguments are in the same direction. These conditions existed in the aforementioned research. Madden et al. stress the need for developing measures of AAD with convergent and discriminant validity.

Also, MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch (1986) did not control for consumer involvement at the time of advertising exposure or at the time of brand evaluation. Some subjects may have processed the advertising at the comprehension level; others at the integration level. Given the experimental pretense, it is unlikely that many subjects processed advertisements at the sensory level. Likewise, some subjects may have been optimizing during the brand evaluation phase of the experiment, while others may have been satisficing; very few were likely to have been indifferent. By not controlling involvement, it is possible that the causal path solution averaged the impact of a group of subjects using different processing and evaluation strategies. Some may have been satisficing, which the RAM predicts would lead to a direct effect of the cognitive sources of AAD on brand evaluation. Some may have been optimizing, which the RAM predicts would have led to a direct effect of brand performance perceptions on brand evaluation.

Brand Name Familiarity

Baker (1985) extended the structural framework of MacKenzie, Lutz, and Belch (1986) by positing direct and indirect effects of a third intervening hypothetical construct, brand Name Familiarity. Brand name familiarity is a unidimensional construct that is directly related to the amount of time that has been spent processing information about the brand regardless of the type or content of the processing that was involved (Baker et al.., 1986). Similar to Lutz' (1985) analysis of the attitude toward the ad construct, Baker et al.. (1986) proposed that brand name familiarity has both affective and evaluative antecedents. The primary affective antecedent is the positive feeling associated with the exposure effect (Zajonc, 1965, 1980). The primary evaluative antecedent is a quality cue generated by consumer's automatic frequency counting mechanism (Hasher & Zacks, 1984). Alba (1985) demonstrated that consumers can use this frequency heuristic as an absolute quality cue (e.g., "I've seen this brand a lot; therefore, it must be good") or even as evidence of relative performance (e.g., "I've seen this brand name more than that brand name; therefore, it must be better") at the time of brand evaluation.

Baker (1985) hypothesized that the mediational potentials of the attitude toward the ad (AAD), brand attribute cognitive structure (CS) and brand name familiarity (BNF) constructs are a direct function of the accessibility of the informational sources of each construct at the time of brand evaluation. An experiment was designed to test the ability of the three constructs to directly, simultaneously, and independently mediate brand attitude and purchase intention, and to test the accessibility thesis. Subjects in all conditions were exposed to advertisements containing the same attribute information. AAD was manipulated by changing advertising background visuals (i.e., advertisement background visuals were designed to evoke positive or negative affective

reactions). BNF was manipulated by differentially exposing subjects to the brand name (via a logo rating task) prior to advertising exposures. Repetition and delay were also manipulated.

Results generally supported the accessibility mechanism. The mediational potential of each construct was related to the accessibility of its informational and affective sources. As brand attribute recall increased, the mediating strength of cognitive structure increased; as advertisement execution recall increased, attitude toward the ad mediation increased; and, as subjective perceptions of brand name familiarity became stronger, its mediation increased.

Although the results suggested that information availability is necessary to realize the mediational potential of each construct, they also suggested that it may not always be a sufficient prerequisite to construct mediation. When cognitive structure mediation was strong, attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity mediation were inhibited, regardless of their accessibility. When the effect of attitude toward the ad was strong, brand name familiarity mediation was inhibited regardless of the strength of brand name perceptions. These peculiarities suggested that the accessibility of higher level information may have inhibited the mediational potential of lower level information in the evaluation process. Similarly, research by Obermiller (1985) showed that the effects of brand name familiarity were facilitated when attention to the brand stimulus was facilitated rather than distracted. However, when cognitive elaboration of the stimulus was facilitated (i.e., higher order processing), the effect was inhibited. That is, brand name familiarity's strongest effects on evaluation occurred when subjects passively processed communication information; they were strongest when higher order effects were attenuated by processing deficits.

The Baker (1985) research is subject to the same criticisms that were leveled at the attitude toward the ad research discussed earlier. Since the experimental manipulations of attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity were weak, the primary analysis moved from ANOVA to GLM regression. A covariate analysis was needed to establish the direct mediating effects of each construct. Also, strong inter-correlations among construct measures, particularly between the attitude toward the ad and brand attribute cognitive structure measures, made the use of covariate analysis an overly conservative measure of construct mediation. Thus, the inhibition effects observed in the experiment were likely to be exaggerated.

The Percentage Contribution model (Batra & Ray, 1985) also modelled the effects of brand attribute cognitive structure, attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity. Like Baker (1985), the authors asserted that the mediating effects of each construct are direct, simultaneous and a direct function of information availability (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973; Reyes, Thompson, & Bower, 1977; Kisielius & Sternthal, 1984). Furthermore, they predicted advertising message involvement (Krugman, 1965, 1971; Batra & Ray, 1981) to be a primary determinant of the type of information that is accessible when purchase intentions are formed. When message response involvement is low, the model predicts that processing would be limited to executional features of the advertising. Conversely, when MRI is high, it is expected that attribute processing would dominate brand attitude mediation.

Initial empirical research generally supported the model's basic propositions. Employing a LISREL analysis to scale measures of the model's constructs, measures of brand name familiarity and attitude toward the ad contributed significantly to brand attitude and purchase intention when message processing involvement was low. When BRI was high, utilitarian performance information

was the dominant mediator of purchase intentions. These results are consistent with the results reported earlier. However, this research is also subject to all the criticisms discussed in the context of the attitude toward the ad research.

Summary

Research on the effects of theoretical constructs influenced the development of the Relevance-Accessibility Model, particularly the three levels of information perspective. Brand attribute cognitive structure corresponds to the RAM's highest level of information, relative performance beliefs; evaluative sources of attitude toward the ad (Lutz, 1985) and the frequency effect related to brand name familiarity (Hasher & Zacks, 1984, Alba, 1984)) correspond to the quality cue level of information; affect linked to the brand through an automatic affect transfer process (Gorn, 1983; Lutz, 1985) and the exposure effect (Obermiller, 1985) correspond to the affect level of information.

This research stream also influenced the RAM by implying that all accessible information is not necessarily used in the brand judgment process. Baker (1985) found that higher level information (e.g., brand attribute cognitive structure) can negate the mediating potential of lower level information (e.g., attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity) when both are accessible.

Despite these contributions, the position taken here is that the use of hypothetical constructs such as attitude toward the ad, brand attribute cognitive structure and brand name familiarity to model advertising effectiveness is a less parsimonious approach than the three mutually exclusive levels of information approach offered by the Relevance-Accessibility Model. Since advertising effects apparently involve complex interactions of the hypothetical constructs described above, rather than predicting the construct-related processes that dominate brand response in any given brand evaluation, the RAM attempts to predict the type of

information expected to drive the ultimate brand response. Within the context of the RAM, these constructs are viewed as unnecessary intervening variables that confound the effects of the model's three levels of information and do not clearly discriminate the effects of involvement on behavior.

Although brand attribute cognitive structure construct can be argued to exclusively capture the effects of relative performance information, attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity capture effects of both pure affect (e.g., classical conditioning, the exposure effect) and quality cues (e.g., source credibility effects, the frequency effect). When affect is the informational antecedent, both attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity may directly mediate brand attitude through a more automatic, nondeliberate process. When quality cues are the source of information, both constructs may mediate brand attitudes directly through a deliberate process and indirectly by influencing brand cognitions.

The levels of information approach is more parsimonious because each mutually exclusive level is associated with just <u>one</u> macro decision process. Although processes can not be directly observed or measured (See Lynch & Srull, 1982), and the ability of consumers to accurately report process is highly questionable (See Nisbett & Wilson, 1978), knowing the level of information that is driving choice permits one to make inferences regarding the macro processes that are likely to be driving choice (e.g., automatic approach effects, simple inferences, multi-stage decision processes). Attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity do not discriminate between levels of information.

The effects of involvement are also accounted for less parsimoniously using the construct approach rather than the levels of information approach. A levels of information approach can posit a clear correspondence between the dominance of each of the three levels of information in the evaluation process with each of three

levels of involvement. At each level of involvement, one of the three levels of information is expected to dominate. The effects of involvement are "muddy" using theoretical constructs. It is not clear which construct dominates the evaluation process at each level of involvement. When involvement is high, brand attribute cognitive structure is expected to have its greatest impact on attitude formation, but attitude toward the ad is expected to exert at least indirect effects on the evaluation process (MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986). When involvement is moderate, the cognitive sources of attitude toward the ad are expected to directly mediate brand attitude (Lutz, 1985), but so might the evaluative source of brand name familiarity (Alba, 1984). When involvement is low, both attitude toward the ad and brand name familiarity are expected to directly mediate attitude formation, but in this scenario, the affective sources of the constructs are expected to mediate the evaluation (Lutz, 1985; Baker et al., 1986).

From a measurement point of view, it is also cleaner to use a levels of information approach. Affect, quality cues and relative performance information are tangible forms of information. Theoretical constructs are intangible, and, as a result their effects are more difficult to capture. Authors have pointed out serious potential measurement problems that may be driving their effects (Madden & Allen, 1985; Mitchell & Olson, 1981; Lutz, 1985; MacKenzie, Lutz & Belch, 1986). Attitude toward the ad, for example, may be capturing effects of executional elements of the advertising, or it may be capturing the effects of unmeasured performance beliefs, or it may be correlated to brand attitude because the measurement scales are similar to the brand attitude scales. Finally, the use of theoretical constructs to study advertising effects is also married to the perspective that brand attitudes, another theoretical construct, ultimately mediate behavior.

It is important to note that the dual mediation hypothesis (Lutz, 1985; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1986, 1989) and the Relevance-Accessibility Model are not necessarily contrarian perspectives. First, they are not operating in the same universe. The dual mediation hypothesis is a model predicting the effect of various theoretical constructs and their antecedents on brand attitude formation. The RAM is a model that predicts the likelihood that an advertisement will mediate choice given its message content, consumer brand response involvement and advertising message involvement. The RAM never proposes that levels of information other than those predicted to dominate the choice process will not contribute to the brand choice process, either directly or indirectly. The Ram is a probabilistic model subject to the reality of individual differences and gray areas along the involvement continuum. It allows for the potential of dual mode processing, but proposes changes in the dominant mode as involvement changes.

The use of theoretical constructs in advertising effects research remains a useful way to model how the different elements of an advertisement may interact to affect brand evaluation, but the Relevance-Accessibility Model's levels of information approach offers a more powerful and parsimonious framework for understanding and predicting advertising's ultimate effectiveness.

CHAPTER 3
THE FORMAL THEORETICAL STRUCTURE

This chapter presents the formal theoretical structure of the Relevance-Accessibility Model of Advertising Effectiveness. It includes three axioms and five principles derived from the implications of the literature reviewed in Chapter Two. To keep the statement of these axioms and principles as succinct and precise as possible, definitions of key terms and constructs are included. After the formal structure is presented, the specific hypotheses tested in this thesis are presented. These hypotheses primarily test Principle Five of the model, the Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution.

Axioms

Axiom 1: The Axiom of Accessibility

Brand Response Potential (1) is a direct function of the motivational properties (2) of salient (3) brand associates (4) at the brand response occasion (4).

Corollary 1.1. Brand associates are represented in memory in a network of propositions (6) which describe and relate concepts (7) and events (8). The contents of working memory (consciousness) at a typical brand response occasion are the sensations and brand associates whose current level of activation (9)

exceeds the threshold required to be salient. Activation spreads from one brand associate to another via the associative links (10) between them.

Corollary 1.2. The accessibility (11) of any given brand associate at any particular brand response occasion is a function of its elaborateness (12), storage efficiency (13), trace strength (14) to the brand concept node,the presence of external activating cues (15), and the number of brand associates linked to the brand concept.

Corollary 1.3. The brand associates salient at any particular brand response occasion are a subset of the total information available (16) in the brand concept.

Axiom One Definitions

Brand response potential (1). The summary force toward or away from the brand, brand response potential is an internal construct embodying the motivational properties of the salient brand associates invoked in the brand response process (17). It is perhaps best construed as an approach-avoidance tendency, an immediate precursor to overt behavior. Brand response potential subsumes constructs such as attitude toward the act of purchase, purchase intention, and brand preference. Operational indicants of brand response potential may include the evaluative scale in the semantic differential, subjective purchase probability scales, brand salience (e.g., first brand awareness), physiological measures of arousal intensity combined with directional scale measures, etc. Ideally, operationalizations should be dictated by the brand response route (18) used by the consumer. For example, if pure affect is expected to be mediating brand response potential, then a measure of the strength and valence of brand associated affect should constitute the operationalization.

Brand associate motivational properties (2). The motivational properties of brand associates are those properties which provide information regarding the ability of the brand to satisfy the behavioral goals present during a particular brand response occasion. In general, associates derived from true experience (e.g., brand usage) have stronger motivational properties than do associates generated through vicarious experience (e.g., advertising) (Smith & Swinyard, 1983; Fazio, 1986).

Brand associate salience (3). Associate salience refers to the presence of a brand associate in working memory during a particular brand response occasion. Like availability, salience is dichotomous, a brand associate is either in working memory or it is not.

Brand associate (4). Any node (19) or associative network (20) (i.e., some associates contain too much information to be stored in a single node) that is linked directly to the identifying brand concept node.

Brand response occasion (5). Any occasion that calls for the elicitation of a brand response potential (e.g., purchase occasion, purchase likelihood elicitation occasion, experimental questionnaire occasion, etc.).

Proposition (6). The basic unit of thought, a typical proposition can be represented structurally as two nodes and an associative link.

Brand concept (7). A brand concept is represented in memory by an identifying brands node from which radiates a series of semantic propositions. A

concept is elaborated in memory as new associative connections form between the concept nodes and other nodes or associative networks in memory.

Brand event (8). A brand event is represented in memory by one or more descriptive episodic propositions involving the brand concept. These are encoded in memory by establishing new associative connections between the brand concept and other concepts used to describe the event.

Activation (9). The process by which brand associates become salient.

Associative link (10). The basic connecting mechanism in memory, a structural relationship which connects nodes by describing their inter-relationship.

Brand Associate accessibility (11). Associate accessibility refers to the likelihood that a given brand associate is salient (i.e. enters working memory) in a particular response occasion. Accessibility is continuous; a brand associate's accessibility must be considered probabilistically.

Brand associate elaborateness (12). The number of routes (i.e., associative links) within the brand response schema by which a brand associate can become activated. Elaborateness is a function of motivational (i.e., cognitive elaboration) and message (i.e. stimulus vividness (21)) factors.

Brand associate efficiency (13). The efficiency of storage of the brand associate in memory in terms of the number of nodes and associative pathways from the brand concept node which must become activated in order for a

meaningful brand associate to become salient. As the number of propositions in the brand associate approaches the minimum required to maintain associate meaning, its efficiency is maximized and the effort required to access the associate is minimized (e.g., a brand associate regarding the relative speed of Camaros and Firebirds may exist in the optimally efficient form "Camaros are faster than Firebirds," or, it may exist in the form of several propositions which could be reduced to optimal form, but until then would require more effort to access and maintain in working memory). The qualitative form of the associate also influences its efficiency (e.g., exposure based affect may be stored in a single node; visual information is typically more efficiently stored than verbal information with the same meaning) (Anderson, 1983; Bargh, 1984; Bower, 1981).

Brand associate trace strength (14). Ceteris paribus, brand associate trace strength is a function of the number of times the associate has been activated (i.e., frequency), the temporal pattern of the activations (e.g., exposure pattern by week, day, hour, etc.), the amount of time since the last activation (i.e., recency) and the arousal intensity evoked by the stimulus (e.g., intensity of affect or emotion; degree of relevance, etc.) (Anderson, 1983; Anderson & Pirolli, 1984).

External activating cues (15). A representation of one or more concepts in the external environment that activate the concept node(s) in memory and initiates spreading activation (e.g., a photograph of a package of Bayer Aspirin will activate the Bayer Aspirin brand concept node and initiate a process of spreading activation emanating from that node).

Brand associate availability (16). Associate availability refers to the presence of a brand associate in the brand concept. Availability is dichotomous; a brand associate is either a part of the brand concept, or it is not.

Brand response process (17). The brand response process is the process that culminates in the evoking of a brand response potential. It involves four interdependent stages: [1] invoking a brand response route, [2] accessing brand associates, [3] selecting a brand response rule (22), and [4] implementing the preferred brand response rule. These stages may range from conscious and deliberate to unconscious and automatic.

Brand response route (18). A macro level brand response process that invokes qualitatively similar brand associates and cognitive operations. In the context of the RAM, there are three qualitative levels of information: affect, quality cues and relative performance information. There are also three general categories of cognitive operations: automatic approach tendencies (e.g., effect of exposure generated affect), simple inferences (e.g., effect of spokesperson endorsement, manufacturer or brand reputation, etc.) or explicit interbrand comparisons (e.g., multi-stage compensatory or non-compensatory choice processes).

Node (19). The basic building block of memory, a structural representation containing words, images and perhaps feeling states.

Associative network (20). An organized system of propositions containing one or more brand concepts and/or brand events.

Vivid stimulus (21). A highly elaborated external representation of a brand associate or concept. Visual information is typically more vivid than verbal information. Such a stimulus minimizes the amount of cognitive effort required to integrate a new brand associate into a well-elaborated brand concept (e.g., a visual demonstration showing how a performance dimension works with other dimensions) or to elaborate a poorly elaborated brand concept (e.g., relating a poorly integrated brand concept to a well-integrated analagous concept).

Brand response rule (22). The specific mode by which brand associates are utilized by the consumer to generate a brand's brand response potential (e.g., lexicographic rules, conjunctive rules, expectancy value rules; rules such as "choose the brand with the most benefits, lowest price, fits my lifestyle, fits my usage situation, most familiar name, I like"). Invoking and implementing the brand response rule may be conscious and deliberate or unconscious and automatic.

Axiom 2: The Axiom of Relevance

The likelihood that a salient brand associate is used to generate brand response potential is a direct function of the degree of relevance (1) of that associate, as perceived by the consumer during the brand response occasion.

Axiom Two Definitions

Relevant brand associate (1). A relevant brand associate is a brand associate capable of mediating a valid brand response (2) at a given brand response occasion, as perceived by the consumer. If, for example, the brand response occasion calls for choosing the best of five brand alternatives, a relevant brand associate is an associate believed by the consumer to be capable of making that discrimination.

Valid brand response (2). A valid brand response is one that satisfies the goals of the consumer in a particular brand response occasion, as perceived by the consumer. For instance, the goal of the consumer may be to choose the "best" brand, a "good" brand, or "any" available brand.

Axiom 3: The Axiom of Involvement Correspondence

Since various types of involvement (1) entail an intensity component and differ only in their directional component, the amount of cognitive effort evoked at any given level of involvement is directly comparable across qualitatively different types of involvement.

Axiom Three Definitions

Involvement (1). Involvement is a motivational construct embodying the intensity of arousal directed at some aspect of the psychological field. As such, the term "involvement" is incomplete without a referent specifying its direction (e.g., advertising message involvement (3), brand response involvement (4)).

Cognitive effort (2). The amount of processing capacity allocated to the processing task.

Advertising message involvement (3). AMI is a motivational construct embodying the arousal intensity directed by the consumer at processing the contents of an advertising message.

Brand response involvement (4) . BRI is a motivational construct embodying the arousal intensity directed by the consumer to implement a brand response process.

Principles

Principle 1: The Principle of Brand Associate Relevance

Ceteris paribus, different brand response routes are perceived to be most relevant and, hence, are invoked along the brand response involvement continuum.

Proposition 1.1. At the high end of the brand response involvement continuum, consumers optimize (1) at the brand response occasion.

Proposition 1.2. In the middle of the brand response involvement continuum, consumers satisfice (2) at the brand response occasion.

Proposition 1.3. At the low end of the brand response involvement continuum, consumers act indifferently (3) at the brand response occasion.

Proposition 1.4. A direct implication of the positive correspondence between the deliberateness (4) of information acquisition and brand response involvement is that the inputting of an appropriate brand associate (5) into the brand response process becomes increasingly a function of its relevance rather than its salience relative to other appropriate brand associates as brand response involvement increases.

Principle One Definitions

Optimizing (1). The brand response route characterized by an extensive information acquisition process, the use of relative brand associates (6) and brand response potential elicitation through a series of highly deliberate compensatory

or noncompensatory cognitive operations. Extensive cognitive effort is required to access appropriate brand associates and to implement the brand response rule. Unlike satisficing, optimizing is characterized by the explicit comparison of two or more brand alternatives on one or more "apples to apples" factors. The degree of effort required to optimize is dependent on the number of brands in the consumer's consideration set, the number of factors on which the brands are compared, and whether or not a compensatory or noncompensatory brand response rule is used. When consumers optimize, the purchase goal at the brand response occasion is to buy the best of a considered set of brands.

Satisficing (2). The brand response route characterized by biased information acquisition (e.g., environmental cues and prior judgments bias the direction of search), the use of absolute brand associates (7) and brand response potential elicitation through simple judgmental inferences. Some deliberate cognitive effort is required to access appropriate brand associates and invoke the brand response rule. Any absolute brand associate which reassures consumers that the brand will meet their purchase goals may be invoked. When consumers satisfice, the purchase goal at the brand response occasion is to choose an acceptable brand. Using automobiles as a an example, such a brand associate may be a simple attribute (e.g., anti-lock brakes), benefit (e.g., fast acceleration), lifestyle association (e.g., automobile for affluent families with children) or situational association (e.g., dependable in any weather conditions). An appropriate brand associate's motivational properties may also be more global. That is, it may be used to summarize the overall quality and desirability of the brand. Using automobiles again, such brand associates may include a friend's recommendation, an independent firm's test results, the manufacturer's reputation, the perceived

fit of the automobile with one's lifestyle or the sound of the front door when it closes.

Indifference (3). The brand response route characterized by information acquisition through the automatic processing system, the use of affective brand associates, and brand response potential elicitation through the intrinsically rewarding properties of salient affect (i.e., negative affect is intrinsically unrewarding and leads to avoidance behavior; positive affect is rewarding and leads to approach behavior). No deliberate cognitive effort is required to implement an indifferent brand response because affect is presumed to be accessed automatically. The salient affect driving the response may be amorphous (i.e., a good feeling, a comfortable feeling) or more specific (i.e., emotions, moods). When consumers are indifferent at the time of choice, the purchase goal at the brand response occasion is to buy any available brand.

Deliberateness (4). Deliberateness is the degree to which consumers control the acquisition of brand associates into working memory. As deliberateness increases, the acquisition process becomes more a function of motivated consumer search and less a function of external activation and automatic processing.

Brand associate appropriateness (5). The appropriateness of a salient brand associate is the degree to which it corresponds to the qualitative form (e.g., affective, absolute brand associate, relative brand associate) of the invoked brand response route.

Relative brand associate (6). A semantic proposition or associative network directly linked to the identifying (brand) node that describes the brand and is

capable of directly facilitating the relative comparison of competing brand alternatives during a particular brand response occasion without invoking additional brand associates derived from internal or external information sources. The associate "Firebirds are faster than Camaros" provides direct relative information, while the associate, "Firebirds' top speed is 120 mph and Camaros' top speed is 100 mph" allows the generation of a relative abstraction without invoking any additional information.

Absolute brand associate (7). A semantic proposition or associative network directly linked to the identifying (brand) node that describes the brand, but is incapable of directly facilitating the relative comparison of competing brand alternatives at a particular brand response occasion without invoking additional brand associates derived from internal or external information sources (e.g., The associate "Camaros are fast cars" does not allow a relative comparison with any other cars also perceived to be "fast").

Principle 2: The Principle of Brand Associate Accessibility

Qualitatively different brand associates are sufficiently encoded (1) at different points along the advertising message involvement continuum.

Proposition 2.1. Ceteris Paribus, relative brand associates, particularly relative brand abstractions (2) are most likely to be sufficiently encoded at the integration (3) level of processing (4) corresponding to the high end of the advertising message involvement continuum,

Proposition 2.2. Ceteris Paribus, absolute brand associates, particularly absolute brand abstractions (5) are most likely to be sufficiently encoded at the

comprehension level of processing (6) corresponding to the middle of the advertising message involvement continuum.

Proposition 2.3. Ceteris Paribus, affective brand associates (7) are most likely to be sufficiently encoded at the sensory level of processing (8) corresponding to the low end of the advertising message involvement continuum.

Proposition 2.4. Consumer processing ability (9) and opportunity constraints (10) moderate the level of AMI, and hence, may cause a level of processing below that intended by the consumer.

Principle Two Definitions

Sufficient encoding (1). A brand associate is sufficiently encoded when its storage efficiency, trace strength, and interconnectedness are such that it is activated when its brand concept is activated in conditions exhibiting at least the same arousal intensity that was present at the time of the associate's encoding. For example, if a brand associate is sufficiently encoded at the sensory identification level of advertising message involvement, then it should normally be accessed when the brand concept is activated at low levels of brand response involvement.

Relative brand abstraction (2). A self-generated relative brand associate.

Integration level processing (3) . The consumer processing goal is to extract relative performance information from the message. Processing is characterized by the activation of elements of the brand response schema (11) that facilitates the comparison of message information with concepts and events relating to

competing brand alternatives (e.g., comparing message information on Camaros with knowledge about Firebirds to assess the relative speed of Camaros). Integration level processing leads to the generation of relative abstractions. Relative abstractions may or may not carry the meaning intended by the advertiser (e.g., the belief that Camaros are faster than Firebirds). As a result, the associates encoded during message exposure may bear little resemblance to the actual propositions put forth in the message. Ceteris paribus, unelaborated message associations (12) are less likely to be accessed at a brand response occasion than message abstractions (13).

Level of processing (4). The extent to which a brand response schema is activated to extract meaning into memory and simultaneously encode brand associates from the message. The level of processing is a direct function of advertising message involvement when the inhibiting effects of consumer processing ability and opportunity are not present.

Absolute brand abstraction (5). A self-generated (i.e., a product of cognitive elaboration) absolute brand associate.

Comprehension level processing (6). The consumer processing goal is to extract quality cue type information from the message. Processing is limited to effortfully activating those portions of the brand response schema that are required to comprehend and interpret the message at an absolute level. Those portions of the brand response schema that are necessary to interpret the message at a relative level are not deliberately activated. Processing is characterized by the deliberate generation of absolute brand abstractions to summarize the extracted meaning of the message ("The car is fast." "The style is sporty." "It

looks tough."). Those portions of the brand response schema required to make relative abstractions ("The car is faster." "The style is sportier." "It looks tougher.") are not deliberately activated. Absolute abstractions may or may not carry the meaning intended by the advertiser (e.g., a feature intended to be a quality cue may or may not be so perceived). Ceteris paribus, message content elements that are not interpreted or summarized via absolute abstractions are less likely to be accessed at a brand response occasion. Comprehension level processing may not limited to the formation of absolute brand associates if the message stimulus, itself, contains relative information that is so encoded by the consumer (e.g., "Camaros are faster than Firebirds.").

Affective brand associate (7). Any node or associative network containing affect, mood, or emotion that is connected to the identifying (brand) concept node through an associative link.

Sensory level processing (8). The consumer processing goal is to attend to intrinsically arousing stimuli as defined by prior experience. Significant encoding into the brand concept is likely to occur only in forced exposure situations when the advertising stimulus is designed in a manner that facilitates the formation of links between concepts in the advertising stimulus and the brand concept. Processing is limited to the external activation and simultaneous encoding of stimulus-based concept nodes and their associates that are products of the automatic processing system. Encoding of activated message information into the brand concept is not deliberate. Neither absolute or relative abstractions are generated. The accessibility of attended stimulus-based concepts is a function of their intrinsic arousal intensity (e.g., novelty, relevance, affect evoking qualities), the number of times activated (which in turn is a function of

the number of times they appear in the message and the number of times the message is repeated) and how efficiently they are communicated in the advertising stimulus (e.g., abstractness, qualitative form). Given these conditions, affective brand associates are more likely to be sufficiently encoded into memory at the sensory identification level than other levels of information. Affect is by definition arousing. It is more likely to be a product of the automatic processing system, and hence, more likely to be activated than other brand associates (Bargh, 1984). And, it is stored more efficiently in memory than other brand associates (Bower, 1981).

Consumer processing ability (9). The ability of consumers to perform the cognitive operations required to generate the qualitative type of brand associate the consumer is motivated to generate (Wright, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).

Consumer processing opportunity (10). The opportunity of consumers to perform the cognitive operations required to generate the qualitative type of brand associate the consumer is motivated to generate (Wright, 1980; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981).

Brand response schema (11). A brand response schema is the associative network of brand associates and the brand response rules that potentially can be invoked to elicit a brand response potential. The network includes all brand concepts and events pertinent to the brand response occasion, as perceived by the consumer. Therefore, the brand response schema subsumes the brand concept.

Message associate (12). An episodic or semantic proposition formed from the content of an advertising stimulus. It may or may not be a brand associate, and

depending on the information's compatibility with the consumer's brand response schema, it may or may not resemble the intended meaning of the advertising stimulus.

Message abstraction (13). A self-generated (i.e., cognitively elaborated) message associate.

Principle Three: The Principle of Brand Response Route Switching

If the implementation of the preferred brand response route is not possible, or if a brand response route is implemented, but no specific brand response is suggested by its outcome, then the consumer will employ an alternate brand response route.

Proposition 3.1. If the consumer response ability (1) is not present to perform the cognitive operations required to execute the motivated brand response route, then the brand response route that is implemented will correspond to the uppermost limit allowed by the level of consumer response ability at the brand response occasion (e.g., if a consumer is motivated to optimize his/her brand response, but has no specific knowledge of considered brand alternatives, then he/she will attempt to satisfice).

Proposition 3.2. If the consumer response opportunity (2) is not present to perform the cognitive operations required to execute the preferred brand response route, then the brand response route that is implemented will correspond to the uppermost limit allowed by the level of consumer response opportunity at the brand response occasion (e.g., if a consumer, faced with choosing one of several brands with which he/she has no prior experience, is motivated to satisfice at the

brand response occasion, but has only seconds to make the choice, then he/she may have no alternative other than to act indifferently).

Proposition 3.3. Within a brand response route, if the implementation of the preferred brand response rule is not possible, or if a brand response rule is implemented, but no specific brand response is suggested by its outcome, then the consumer will employ an alternate brand response rule if there is sufficient consumer response ability and opportunity to do so.

Proposition 3.4. If no brand response process can discriminate among alternate brands at the brand response occasion, then the consumer will behave virtually randomly.

Principle Three Definitions

Consumer response ability (1). The ability of consumers to perform the cognitive operations required to implement each stage of the preferred brand response process.

Consumer response opportunity (2). The opportunity of consumers to perform the cognitive operations required to implement each stage of the preferred brand response process.

Principle Four: The Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution

An advertising strategy which maximizes the accessibility of appropriate brand associates, more relevant to the invoked brand response route than other appropriate brand associates (e.g., POP information), has a higher probability of

contributing to the invoked brand response process than do alternate message strategies.

Proposition 4.1. Ceteris Paribus, the likelihood that advertising contributes to the brand response process is an inverse function of the discrepancy between advertising message involvement and brand response involvement.

Corollary 4.11. Advertising generated brand associates become increasingly inappropriate as the discrepancy between AMI and BRI increases (e.g., if BRI is high, then consumers are motivated to seek relative brand associates to discriminate brand alternatives. Advertising-generated brand associates are most likely to be relative brand associates when AMI is high and least likely to be relative brand associates when AMI is low.).

Corollary 4.12. Appropriate advertising generated brand associates become increasingly less accessible as the discrepancy between AMI and BRI increases (e.g., if BRI is high, then consumers will be motivated to seek relative performance information to discriminate brand alternatives. Advertising generated relative brand associates are least likely to be sufficiently encoded when AMI is low and most likely to be sufficiently encoded when AMI is high.).

Proposition 4.2. The likelihood that any salient, appropriate, advertising-generated brand associate contributes to the invoked brand response process is a direct function of the relevance of these associates relative to other salient brand associates (e.g., POP information, information learned through product usage, package information, etc.).

Proposition 4.3. If there is no specific preferred brand response rule within the invoked brand response route, then the likelihood that any appropriate advertising-generated brand associate contributes to the brand response process is a function of its salience relative to other appropriate brand associates (i.e., order of retrieval).

Principle 5: The Principle of Prior Preference

The likelihood that a consumer's brand response potential is directly mediated by a salient prior preference (1) is a direct function of the perceived similarity of the given brand response occasion with the brand response occasion that evoked the prior preference.

Principle Five Definitions

Brand preference (1). An explicit context dependent assertion of a brand's relative advantage over one or more other brands. Brand preference is a function of the choice-related motivational properties of relevant brand associates that are accessed at a brand response occasion. Choice is a behavioral expression of preference, but a preference is not necessarily explicitly formed or sufficiently encoded in memory at the brand response occasion.

Experimental Hypotheses

Three hypotheses derived from the Relevance-Accessibility Model of Advertising Effectiveness were the object of the first empirical test of the model. These hypotheses relate most directly to the Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution, but also relate to the Principle of Brand Associate Relevance and

the Principle of Advertising-Generated Brand Associate Accessibility. Hypothesis One, however, is a more general test of the thesis.

Hypothesis One. Both advertising message involvement and brand response involvement directly influence the effect of advertising on brand choice.

If supported, the major implication of Hypothesis One is that advertising effects on brand choice need be studied in the context of both the advertising exposure occasion and the brand response occasion. Theoretical perspectives that study advertising effectiveness from the point of view of the advertising exposure occasion or the brand response occasion, but not both, are incomplete. According to the RAM, consumer cognitive activity at the advertising exposure occasion affects the accessibility of advertising information, while consumer cognitive activity at the brand response occasion affects the perceived relevance of that information. Both accessibility and relevance must be achieved before advertising can be effective.

Hypothesis Two. When advertising message involvement and brand response involvement correspond, the form of advertising message content most likely to mediate brand choice is the one that focuses on the level of information typically associated with that degree of involvement.

Hypothesis two directly tests one implication of the Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution. It also indirectly tests Principles 1 and 2. As shown in Figure 3, it predicts, for example, that when both advertising message involvement and brand response involvement are low, an advertising strategy focusing on associating simple affect to a brand will be more effective than a strategy emphasizing quality cue or relative performance information. As stated in Principle 1, when brand response involvement is low, consumers are predicted to be more likely to act "indifferently" than to either "satisfice" or "optimize." As

a result, they will seek to discriminate brands on the basis of simple affective associations to brands. As stated in Principle 2, when advertising message involvement is very low, consumers are expected to be more likely to sufficiently encode affect than either quality cue or relative performance level information. Thus, when advertising message involvement and brand response involvement are both low, there is a correspondence between the the type of advertising generated information that is likely to be most accessible and the type of information that consumers seek to choose a brand. For similar reasons, an advertising message strategy employing quality cue-type information is expected to be more effective than affect-based or relative performance-based strategies when both AMI and BRI are moderate.

Hypothesis Three. Message content that focuses on one of the three levels of information is more likely to mediate choice when AMI and BRI correspond to that level of information than when only AMI or BRI or neither corresponds to that level of information.

Hypothesis Three tests another implication of the Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution. Like Hypothesis Two, it also indirectly tests Principles 1 and 2. It predicts, for example, that an advertising message containing relative performance information will be more effective when both advertising message involvement and brand response involvement are high then when only one or the other is high, and especially when neither is high. When both AMI and BRI are high, an advertising strategy employing relative performance information is expected to have the highest probability of success, because according to Principles 1 and 2 relative performance information is more likely to be both efficiently encoded into memory at the advertising exposure occasion and deliberately sought to discriminate brands at the brand response

occasion. When AMI or BRI (but not both) is high, then there is more likely to be a breakdown in either the accessibility of relative performance information (low or moderate AMI) or the perceived relevance of relative performance information (low or moderate BRI). When both AMI and BRI are not high, then there is even more likelihood of a breakdown in both the accessibility and perceived relevance of relative performance information, lowering further the probability it will be used to discriminate brands. This concludes Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents the experimental design and methodology used to test these three hypotheses.

CHAPTER 4
METHOD

Experimental Rationale

An experiment was designed to address the aforementioned hypotheses and their implications for the study of advertising effectiveness. The first and most general implication of results supportive of the hypotheses would be the need to study advertising effectiveness from the point of view of both the advertising exposure occasion and the brand response occasion. Supportive results would question the adequacy of theoretical models that ignore the role of either the brand response occasion or confound the advertising exposure occasion with the brand response occasion. The Availability-Valence Hypothesis, the Principle of Higher Level Dominance and the Elaboration Likelihood Model are examples of models related to the issue of advertising effectiveness that do not make clear distinctions between the two occasions.

A second related implication of an experimental outcome consistent with the experimental hypotheses is that a major breakdown in advertising effectiveness occurs when the qualitative level of information most likely to be sought by consumers at the brand response occasion does not correspond to the qualitative level of information most likely to be sufficiently encoded at the advertising exposure occasion. Advertising messages that do not communicate information relevant to the brand response category consumers invoke at the brand response occasion are less likely to be successful. For example, if consumers are expected to try to optimize at

the brand response occasion, but advertising effectively communicates only affect, then advertising is less likely to be effective. Furthermore, even if the advertising message contains the appropriate level of information, it is not likely to be effective unless it is processed at a level of advertising message involvement corresponding to expected consumer brand response involvement. For example, if advertising communicates relevant relative performance information and consumers are optimizing their brand choice at the brand response occasion, then advertising is still unlikely to be effective unless consumers are also characterized by high advertising message involvement when they are exposed to the advertising.

A third implication is that when advertisers expect it will be difficult to motivate the level of advertising message involvement necessary to sufficiently encode the information consumers are expected to use at the brand choice occasion (e.g., advertisers expect advertising message involvement to be lower than brand response involvement), perhaps because there is little interest in the advertised product class and brand information is readily available at the point of purchase, then other elements of the promotional mix such as packaging, point of purchase information, couponing and trade dealing may be more effective than advertising. In this scenario, the role of advertising may be reduced to establishing baseline credibility and consideration rather than to directly impact on choice.

Experimental Design

Several priorities were established for the experimental design to improve the research's internal and external validity, and to attempt to overcome some areas of concern with some recent communication effects research. The first concern was the manipulation of advertising message involvement and brand response

involvement. Several recent communication effects experiments in marketing (e.g., Mitchell, Gardner & Russo, 1983; Park & Young, 1984) appear to have manipulated the direction of processing rather than the intensity of processing. Subjects were told to attend either to the executional aspects of advertising or to message content;. antecedents of involvement were not manipulated. Since subjects were told explicitly what aspect of advertising to attend in each involvement condition, it can be argued that both advertising message involvement and at least some of its consequences were manipulated. A priority of this research was to study the "natural" consequences of advertising message involvement. A manipulation that arguably manipulates the consequences of involvement rather than involvement per se threatens internal validity. So, a priority was placed on manipulating the intensity of consumer message processing and decision-making, not its direction.

A second priority was to use advertising stimuli as representative of the "real world" as possible. Stark, controlled advertising stimuli arguably can increase internal validity by limiting the potential sources of variation in experimental measures, but only at the expense of external validity. Since the relevance-accessibility model is a framework for understanding and predicting advertising effectiveness, issues of external validity cannot be ignored. A third priority was to avoid correlational tests of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Much of the research involving the attitude toward the ad construct, for example, has depended on covariate type analyses (e.g., Mitchell & Olson, 1981) or more sophisticated causal path analyses (e.g., Lutz, MacKenzie & Belch, 1986).

Since the relevance-accessibility model critiques the use of brand attitude measures as predictors of choice, choice itself needed to be the primary dependent variable in the experiment. Relatedly, since the model argues that advertising

effectiveness must be studied in the context of the brand response occasion, it became important to test the hypotheses in a competitive environment.

A 3 x 3 between subject design manipulating advertising message involvement and brand response involvement was executed. The subjects were two hundred sixty students from a University of Florida Principles of Marketing course. Students were given extra credit points for their participation; monetary incentives were also awarded. One hundred fifty-five women and 110 males participated.

Subjects were exposed to radio advertisements for three fictitious brands of motor oil: Purity, Easyride and Austin. Three different message appeals were also created. Each appeal contained information designed to be maximally effective at one of the three involvement levels considered by the RAM. More specifically, each advertising appeal was designed to contain information that would match consumer processing goals at one of the three levels of advertising message involvement. Likewise, each appeal was designed to match consumer choice goals at one of the three levels of brand response involvement. The brand names and the appeals were rotated to avoid systematic brand name effects. Each subject heard each motor oil advertisement (i.e., each of the three appeals) three times.

Motor oil was selected for two reasons. First, it is a product class with which almost everyone is familiar, but for which few people are experts. As a result, it was expected that advertising message information would be understood relatively uniformly with a minimum of counter-argumentation. Second, it is a product class where appeals pertaining to each of the RAM's three levels of involvement are plausible. Participation was limited to students who owned, but did not work on their own cars. The goal was to recruit people familiar with motor oil, but to eliminate people with well-defined schemas and preference structures for motor oil that could potentially inhibit the impact of the involvement manipulations.

The advertisement expected to be maximally effective in the high brand response involvement-high advertising message involvement experimental cell promoted superior attribute information. The "optimizing" advertisement message claimed that the brand's graphite mixture increases gas mileage 30% more than any other motor oil and that its extra processing time prevents motor oil breakdown up to twice as long as other motor oils. The advertisement expected to be most effective in the moderate brand response involvement-moderate advertising message involvement cell communicated superior quality cue type information. The "satisficing" advertisement ostensibly used a famous race car driver, A.J. Foyt, to endorse the brand. It also contained absolute information on the same two attributes used in the optimizing ad (i.e., increases gas mileage and helps prevent motor oil breakdown). The advertisement designed to be most effective in the low brand response involvement-low advertising message involvement cell contained superior affect evoking stimuli. The "indifferent" advertisement attempted to facilitate affect transfer by associating the brand name to affect evoking music (i.e., a popular rock song about cars) and triggering the exposure effect by repeating the brand name several times in the course of the spot. The contents of these advertisements were determined by a series of pretests, which will be described later in this chapter. The full text of each advertisement is found in Appendix A.

Radio was selected as the advertising medium because of the difficulty, time, and expense of creating professional looking print or television ads. Affective manipulations using audio stimuli have proved to be successful and relatively easy to implement (Gorn, 1982; McSweeney & Bierly, 1985; Park & Young, 1986). The radio advertisements were produced and embedded in a half hour segment of a Lone Ranger episode. Evaluation of the viability of airing old time radio shows, specifically the Lone Ranger, on campus radio stations was the primary experimental pretense. Each of the three motor oil advertisements was repeated

three times during the radio show. Three real advertisements for local area clothing stores were also embedded in the show and repeated twice each. The sequence in which motor oil advertisements were placed throughout the radio program was counter-balanced across all nine insertion points to control for primacy and recency effects, as well as order effects.

Experimental Procedure

The chronology of the experimental procedure is depicted in Table 3 below. On the first day of the experiment, subjects were given the advertising message involvement manipulation (described later) and were exposed to the Lone Ranger radio presentation with its embedded advertising; they then completed a memory test of the radio presentation content. This exercise was linked to the advertising message involvement manipulation and tested subjects' recognition and recall of the Lone Ranger episode and inserted advertising. Questions about the advertising were limited to the clothing store advertisements. This avoided a confound between the advertising message involvement manipulation and the memory test as a mediator of the accessibility of motor oil advertising message information. After the memory test, subjects were excused and returned after a two day-delay (i.e., subjects whose first experimental session was on a Monday returned on Wednesday). Subjects were told that the purpose of the second session was to rate the Lone Ranger on several criteria, no mention of the advertising was made.

The second experimental session began with an evaluation of the Lone Ranger radio show. This exercise was conducted to inhibit demand effects by remaining consistent with the avowed purpose of the experiment. Then, the brand response involvement manipulation was applied, followed immediately by the brand choice

task. Within each brand response involvement condition, the motor oil brand choice was one of two or three questions inserted into the section of the experimental booklet entitled "Advertising Related Questions." After the brand choice task, subjects answered a series of questions designed to assess the potential of experimental demand effects. The advertising message involvement and brand response involvement manipulation checks followed.

The subsequent series of questions did not relate directly to the experimental hypotheses of this thesis. For the most part, the data from these questions will not be reported in this thesis. The data are, however, relevant to the axioms and propositions of the relevance-accessibility model and will be used in future research. First, subjects engaged in an advertising recall task. Participants were explicitly requested to spend three minutes attempting to recall the content of each of the three advertisements. They were not allowed to progress through the booklet until nine minutes elapsed. Next, subjects were asked to choose which of the three advertisements proved to be the most credible and believable, which most successfully communicated the benefits "increased fuel economy" and "extended engine life" and which evoked the most positive feelings. The inclusion of these questions will permit the specific tracing of information accessibility across each of the experimental cells.

Finally, subjects were asked, "Now that you've had considerably more time to think about motor oils than you had when you made your choice, would you like to change your motor oil choice?" It was expected, for example, that people in the high advertising message involvement - low brand response involvement cell would be most likely to change their choice because they were expected to have sufficiently encoded relative performance information at the advertising exposure occasion, but were not expected to have been motivated at the time of the brand choice task to use it. The experimental requirement to effortfully recall , interpret and evaluate the

advertising information "forced" participants to simulate more natural high BRI. cognitive activity The full text of the experimental questionnaires used in both experimental sessions is available in Appendix B.

Table 3
Experimental Procedure

Session 1:

- Advertising Message Involvement Manipulation
- Advertising Presentation
- Presentation Memory Test
- Subjects Excused: Two Day Delay

Session 2:

- Lone Ranger Evaluation
- Brand Response Involvement Manipulation
- Brand Appeal Choice Task
- Demand Effect Test
- Choice-Related Follow-Up Questions
- Advertising Message Involvement Manipulation Check
- Brand Response Involvement Manipulation Check
- Detailed Advertising Recall Task
- Selection of the Most Affective, Credible and Informative Ad
- Subjects Paid (If Required Test Score Achieved) and Excused

Independent Variables

Advertising Message Involvement

The advertising message involvement manipulations consisted of a set of instructions designed to manipulate the intensity of processing, i.e., the total cognitive effort directed toward the advertising, without specifically directing subjects to any part of the advertising stimulus. Care was also taken to design a

manipulation that did not suggest to subjects that an evaluation of the advertised brands was necessarily forthcoming, which would have created a simulated brand response occasion at the advertising exposure occasion, thus prematurely "forcing" brand evaluations and/or preference formation. The manipulation instructions were cast in the context of the experimental pretense. The first part of these instructions were the same for each of the three levels of advertising message involvement. On the cover page of the experimental booklet, subjects read the following:

on the next page you will read a description of the radio program and its accompanying advertisements. It is very important that you read these instructions carefully. If you do not allocate your attention in the manner in which you are instructed, it is very unlikely that you will be able to do well on the memory test that follows the program. There is a monetary reward if you perform well on this test.

After reading the cover page, subjects were told to turn the page. The first two paragraphs of the ensuing instructions were the same for all subjects. The purpose of these paragraphs was to minimize the likelihood of experimental demand effects by communicating a believable pretense for the presentation of the radio show and its accompanying advertising. It was expected that demand effects would be minimized if advertising for multiple product categories was included. This created a more natural advertising environment and inhibited subjects from making interbrand comparisons at the advertising exposure occasion. The instructions were preceded by the heading, "Carefully Read Through These Instructions Twice" and read as follows:

in a few moments you will listen to segments of an old time radio show: "The Lone Ranger." There is renewed interest in this and other old time radio shows, particularly among young people, in many parts of the north. As a result, it is being considered for use by a local rock radio station. The producers and advertising sponsors of these programs are interested in estimating their appeal to several audience types in the Gainesville area. That's why you are here. As

you listen, you will notice an unusually high number of advertisements in two product categories: clothing stores (you will hear advertisements for Maas Brothers, Annie Hall, and Dollar General) and motor oils (you will hear advertisements for Purity, Austin, and Easyride). Beyond assessing the appeal of the Lone Ranger, potential sponsors are trying to assess student receptivity to advertising in these categories.

The next paragraph contained the first part of the advertising message involvement manipulation and varied across treatment cells. Subjects in each condition were directed to divide their attention between the show and the advertising at varying levels, but in no way were they asked to attend differentially to any part of the advertising stimuli. Specifically, subjects were asked only to pay normal attention, above normal attention or below normal attention to advertising. The instructions are listed below.

High Involvement Condition: We would like you to listen to the Lone Ranger as you would normally listen to any radio show with which you are interested. We would like you to pay considerably more than normal attention to the advertising accompanying the Lone Ranger. You should listen to the Lone Ranger to remember the basic plots of the show segments. You should listen to all the advertisements to remember their themes and their specific details.

Moderate Involvement Condition: We would like you to listen to the advertising accompanying the program as you normally listen to radio advertising in product categories where you make frequent purchases. You should be able to associate each brand name with its general advertising theme. We would like you to listen to the Lone Ranger considerably more intently than you normally listen to any radio show. You should be able to remember specific details of the Lone Ranger episodes.

Low Involvement Condition: We would like you to listen to the Lone Ranger considerably more carefully than you would normally listen to any radio show in which you are interested. Other individuals are being asked to listen to the advertising accompanying the show, so you may disregard any advertising.

The following paragraph applied to the second part of the manipulation. It was designed to manipulate one of the antecedents of advertising message involvement, the need for information (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983), by providing monetary

incentives for attending to information as instructed. Through a combination of instructions and examples, the learning requirements for the test were clarified. This step was taken to inhibit high involvement processing of the material across all involvement conditions. It was feared that, without specific guidelines, anticipation of a test would overpower the basic manipulation instructions. Subjects in the high involvement condition were told that they would be expected to recall specific details of the advertising. Subjects in the moderate involvement condition were told that they would be expected to recognize the executional theme or main message idea of the advertising. Subjects in the low involvement condition were not asked to remember anything about the advertising.

High Involvement Condition. Immediately after the program you will be given a memory test requiring you to recognize simple summaries of the Lone Ranger episodes, but to recall specific details about the brand advertisements (a much more difficult task). There will be 5 true-false questions about the Lone Ranger and 5 fill-in the blank questions about the advertisements. Any person who answers 90% of the questions correctly will earn $5.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded. Below are some examples of the questions you may be asked.

1. The name of the Lone Ranger's horse is Silver. T F
2. The Lone Ranger and Tonto met when they were children. T F
3. List two of the advertised items in the "Maas Brothers" advertisement.
4. Which store is known for "Everyday Low Prices?"

Moderate Involvement Condition. Immediately after the program you will be given a memory test requiring you to simply recognize the advertising themes of advertised brands, but to recall specific details about the Lone Ranger episodes (This is a much more difficult task than remembering advertising themes; therefore, most of your attention should be put here). There will be 7 fill-in the blank questions about the Lone Ranger and 3 true-false questions about the advertising. Any person who answers 80% of the questions correctly will earn $1.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded. Below are some examples of the questions you may be asked.

1. The advertisements for Maas Brothers had a rock music background. T F
2. Dollar general stores were advertising a sale. T F
3. How many graves did Tonto dig after the Cavendish raid?
4. In the second episode, who shot the Lone Ranger's horse?

Low Involvement Condition. Immediately after the program you will be given a memory test requiring you to recall specific details about the Lone Ranger episodes. There will be ten fill in the blank questions about the Lone Ranger. Any person who answers 90% of the questions correctly will earn $5.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded. Below are some examples of the questions you may be asked:

1. What was the full name of the Lone Ranger's nephew?
2. In the second episode, who shot the Lone Ranger's horse?
3. After the ambush, how many days was the Lone Ranger unconscious?

The advertising message involvement manipulation check included a series of four semantic differential scales designed to measure the intensity of subjects' advertising-directed attention and a series of five agree-disagree scales that measured qualitative aspects of subjects' advertising processing experience. These latter measures were taken in the second experimental session immediately after the brand choice task. The specific instructions are included below. Manipulation check pretest results are presented later in this chapter; the manipulation checks from the main experiment are reported in Chapter 5.

Think back to the set of motor oil advertisements that you listened to yesterday. Using the scales below describe your level of attention to the motor oil advertisements. That is, characterize the quality of your attention to these statements.

1. Very Low ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very High
   Normal
2. Very Motivated ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very Unmotivated
   Moderately Motivated
3. Very Intense ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Not at all intense
   Moderately Intense
4. Didn't Matter ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Mattered a Lot
   Mattered Moderately

Below are some statements that describe the approach you may have taken to listen to the motor oil advertisements. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. I tried to memorize the content of the motor oil advertisements.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree
   Somewhat
2. I explicitly compared the content of the three motor oil advertisements as I listened to them.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree
   Somewhat
3. Basically, I disregarded the advertisements.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree
   Somewhat
4. I didn't decide which motor oil I liked the most until today when I was asked to choose one of them.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree
   Somewhat

Brand Response Involvement

The brand response involvement manipulation was executed the second day of the experiment. The objective was to manipulate the intensity of cognitive effort directed at the brand response process, but not to explicitly direct subjects to use a specific level of information to discriminate brands. Again, there were two components to the manipulation. The first element was a manipulation of risk, an antecedent of brand response involvement. Both the risk of making an incorrect brand choice and risk consequences, the outcome of making an incorrect brand choice (Robertson, 1976; Kapferer & Laurent, 1985), were manipulated. The former was manipulated by influencing perceptions of product class differentiation. The latter was manipulated by monetary incentives.

In the high brand response involvement condition, subjects were explicitly told that one of the three advertised brands of motor oil was better than the others and they were offered $5.00 if they could choose that best brand. In the moderate brand response involvement condition, subjects were told that two of the three brands were of equally high quality and that they would be awarded $1.00 if they chose one of the

two brands. In the low brand response involvement condition, subjects were told simply to choose a brand of motor oil they liked; no comments about relative quality were made and no monetary incentives were offered.

The second element of the manipulation involved brand response opportunity. This component was added to prevent subjects from spending more time than necessary to complete the task. Given the competitive nature of the experimental environment (i.e., a test situation) and the presence of monetary incentives, it was feared that the involvement manipulations may break down if subjects were given too much time to make decisions. A time constraint was added to inhibit subjects from performing beyond the stated requirements to improve their performance. Thus, subjects were given one minute to complete their assigned motor oil choice task;.some subjects, however, had to complete other tasks within that one minute time frame. The instructions relating to each treatment cell are presented below.

High Brand Response Involvement. You are about to be asked a question about the product classes that were advertised during the programming you heard in the first experimental session. If you give the correct answer to each question you will win $5.00. One incorrect answer and you win nothing. In a few moments, the experimenter will instruct you to turn the page. Read the question. Think carefully before you answer the question. You will have 1 minute to think before the experimenter asks you to circle one of the brands.

1. Assuming that you want to buy the highest quality motor oil available and you must choose from the three brands below, which brand would you choose? Think carefully. The experimenter will ask you to circle one of the brands in 1 minute.
   a. Purity
   b. Austin
   c. Easyride

Moderate Brand Response Involvement. On the next page there are 3 questions. There are three possible answers to each question. Two of the three possible answers to each question are satisfactory. One is unsatisfactory. If you give a satisfactory response to each question you will win $1.00. You must respond to all three questions within 1 minute. At the end of the minute the experimenter will instruct you to flip the page and turn in the questionnaire.

1. Two of the three advertised clothing stores carry the highest quality items. Choose one of these two stores.

2. Two of the advertised motor oils are likely to be of high quality. Choose one of these brands of motor oil.
   a. Purity
   b. Austin
   c. Easyride

3. Two of the advertised clothing stores advertised a sale. List one of these two stores.

Low Brand Response Involvement. On the next page, you'll find a list of brands in twelve heavily advertised product classes. When the experimenter instructs you, turn the page and simply choose a brand that you like from each product class. Choose quickly. You have one minute to choose a brand from each product category. At the end of the minute you will be asked to stop and to turn in the questionnaire.

[Eleven other product categories included, each with three brand alternatives]

7. Choose a brand of motor oil you like:
   a. Easyride
   b. Austin
   c. Purity

The other product categories included in the low brand response involvement manipulation were clothing stores (the three clothing stores advertised in the experimental presentation), pizza restaurants, gasoline, laundry detergents, beer, cereal, soap, breakfast restaurants, deodorants, toothpaste and candy bars. Motor oil was the seventh product category subjects encountered.

The brand response involvement manipulation check included a series of four semantic differential scales designed to measure the level of intensity with which subjects approached the motor oil brand choice task and 3 other questions that assessed qualitative aspects of the motor oil brand response process. More specifically these other questions assessed the effort subjects expended to access advertising information from memory, compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of brands, and choose the best brand rather than a good brand or any

brand. These measures were taken in the second experimental session immediately after the advertising message involvement manipulation check. The specific instructions are below. Pretest manipulation checks are presented in later in this chapter; the main experiment manipulation checks are presented in Chapter 5.

A. Think back to the motor oil choice you just made. Use the scales below to describe the amount of thought you were able to put into your motor oil choice. That is characterize the effort you expended to make the motor oil choice. Consider only the effort that characterized your motor oil choice, not the effort you may have spent on the other questions that accompanied the motor oil question.

1. Very Motivated ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Very Unmotivated
   Moderately Motivated
2. Didn't Matter ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ____ Mattered a Lot
   Mattered Moderately
3. Of Strong Concern ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Of No Concern
   Of Moderate Concern
4. Meant Nothing ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Meant a Lot
   Moderate Meaning

B. Below are some statements that describe the approach you may have taken make your motor oil choice. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. I tried to memorize the content of the motor advertisements.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree

2. I tried very hard to compare all the plusses and minuses of each advertised brand before I made my choice.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree

3. Check the statement that best characterizes the manner in which you made your brand choice.
a. I didn't think much about my choice; instead, I chose the brand with which I felt most comfortable.
b. I made a serious effort to choose the best of the three brands.
c. I tried to choose a good brand, not necessarily the best brand.

Primary Dependent Variable

The RAM predicts the level of information that consumers are expected to most typically use at the brand response occasion to make their brand choice. For this reason, the primary dependent variable in the study was message appeal choice.rather than brand name choice. Brand choice (i.e., brand name choice) was originally selected to be the primary dependent variable, but only because the possibility that subjects would incorrectly link brand names to message appeals was not considered. A perfect correspondence was presumed. Post-choice recall measures later revealed that at least 19% of all respondents incorrectly linked brand names with message appeals. Given the cluttered competitive environment of the advertising presentation (i.e., nine advertisements for three brands of motor oils) and the absence of any prior familiarity with the brand names, this outcome should have been anticipated (Keller, 1987, 1989; Burke & Srull, 1988).

Post-choice recall measure made it possible to determine the message appeal subjects believed to be associated to the brand name they selected. This message appeal became the primary dependent variable. For example, in a given experimental session, the chosen brand name, Purity, in reality, may have been linked to the indifferent message appeal, but a subject may have believed Purity to be associated to the satisficing appeal. In such a case, the chosen message appeal was recorded as the satisficing appeal. Eighty nine percent of subjects correctly identified the appeal paired with the brand name they selected (or it was impossible to identify the appeal they linked to the brand name they selected, e.g., recall question unanswered). Changes were made in only 19% of cases. As will be discussed in Chapter 5, only about half these changes supported the experimental hypotheses. Both brand name choice and message appeal choice results will be presented in Chapter 5. The specific recall question is reported below.

Please recall as many details as you can about each of the ads. First, describe the ad's theme. Then, list the ad's content. Be as specific as possible. Discuss one ad at a time. Do not evaluate the content here; just write down what you remember about the advertising content. You should spend at least 3 minutes on each brand.

Experimental Pretests

Four sets of pretests were conducted prior to the main experiment. The first was designed to identify three brand names with similar credibility and quality associations in the motor oil category. The objective of the second was to isolate the most appropriate message content for each of the three advertisements. Experimental sessions were held to find appropriate affect evoking music for the "indifferent" advertising message, a strong quality cue for the "satisficing" advertising message and relevant relative performance information for the "optimizing" message. The purpose of the third pretest was to confirm that each advertising message strategy was effectively communicating information corresponding to its brand response category. Tests were designed to confirm that the "indifferent" appeal most effectively communicated affect, the "satisficing" appeal communicated the strongest quality cue and the optimizing appeal communicated the most compelling relative performance benefits. The final pretest tested the advertising message involvement and brand response involvement manipulations. All subjects in these pretests were University of Florida students enrolled in a principles of marketing course. Participation in the experimental sessions was voluntary and was rewarded with extra credit points.

Brand Name Pretests

The brand name pretests were executed in two phases. The goal of the first phase was to isolate three brand names with similar levels of credibility in the

motor oil product category. Twenty eight subjects rated the degree to which they could confidently recognize a series of names to be the brand names of motor oil. Twenty five brand names were included in the test; 13 were real motor oil brand names; 12 were fictitious. Subjects rated each name on a 7 point scale with "+3" meaning "you definitely recognize it as being a motor oil" and "-3" meaning "you definitely do not think it's a brand of motor oil."

It would have been ideal if the three fictitious brand names for the study had recognition ratings that that did not significantly differ from the average rating of the real brand names. However, it is sufficient that the three names have ratings that did not significantly differ from each other. The latter result occurred. Results were analyzed through ANOVA and paired comparison follow-up tests. A one-way within subjects ANOVA including the mean ratings of each fictitious brand name and the average of all real brand names was significant ($F(12, 250)=8.67$ $p<.0001$). A Duncan's Multiple Range paired comparison analysis revealed that 10 of the 12 brand names did not significantly differ in recognition ratings at the 95% confidence interval. The five brands in this group with the highest false recognition scores were selected for the second phase of the brand name testing process. All five of these brands, however, had recognition ratings significantly below the average rating of the real brands in the pretest. A sixth brand name, Supraline, was initially included, but later dropped from consideration. Since its significantly higher false recognition score may have put it closer to the category exemplar, it was feared that subjects would develop stronger quality associations it (Cohen, 1982; Barsalou, 1985; Alba & Hutchinson, 1986). The results of this pretest are presented in Table 4 below. The complete text of the pretest instructions can be found in Appendix C of this thesis.

Table 4
Brand Name Pretest "Believability" Results

Brand Name	Mean Rating**	Duncan's Test Results***		
Real Brand Names*	1.34	A		
Supraline	.48	B		
Dutchblend	-.51		C	
Easyride	-.67		C	
Purity	-.67		C	
Austin	-.67		C	
Guardline	-.74		C	
Ram	-.78		C	
Torque	-.81		C	
Dixon	-1.00		C	D
Southwestern	-1.03		C	D
Ridall	-1.11		C	D
Sunpower	-1.87			D

* The ratings of the real brand names averaged together were Havoline Valvoline, Multipower, Arco Graphite, Mobile Fire & Ice, All-Season, Mobile 1, Gulfpride, Pennzoil, Castrol, Quaker State, Ultra D and Kendall.

** Ratings were made on a seven point scale with "+3" meaning "you definitely recognize it a being a motor oil" and "-3" meaning "you definitely do not think it's a brand of motor oil."

*** Brand ratings sharing the same letter do not statistically differ from another at the 95% confidence level.

The purpose of the second brand name pretest was to isolate the three brand names with the most similar initial quality associations. The six brand names were compared to each other on a paired comparison rating task. Brand names were rated on three dimensions: brand name familiarity, brand associated affect and brand associated quality. In each rating task, each brand name was explicitly compared to every other brand name on a seven point scale. On each dimension, in each comparison, a rating of "+3" indicated the strongest possible advantage for one brand, a rating of "-3" reflected the strongest possible advantage for the other brand.

The comparison ratings on the <u>familiarity</u> dimension were designed to reflect the degree to which subjects perceived to have seen or heard one test brand name more than the others. The comparisons on the <u>affective</u> dimension were designed to capture the extent to which one brand engendered a more pleasant reaction that the

others. In the quality task, subjects compared the relative perceived quality associations to each brand name (or the lack thereof). The familiarity and affective ratings of the names were generic; subjects were not told that these were brand names for motor oil. The quality ratings, however, were context specific; subjects were told they were rating brand name candidates for a new brand of motor oil.

In a one-way, within subjects ANOVA, significant differences among brand names were found across all three dimensions [familiarity: ($F(5,143)=6.55$, $p<.0001$), affect: ($F(5, 143)=4.47$, $p < .001$), quality: ($F(5, 143)=3.24$, $p < .009$). A Duncan's multiple range paired comparison follow-up revealed that there were no three brand combinations that did not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level on at least one of the three dimensions. The pretest results are reported in Tables 5, 6 and 7 below.

Table 5
Brand Name Pretest Two "Familiarity" Ratings

Brand Name	Mean Rating	Duncan's Test Results*		
Dutchblend	.77	A		
Purity	.40	A	B	
Easyride	-.11		B	C
Austin	-.26			C
Guardline	-.38			C
Supraline	-.52			C

* Brand ratings sharing the same letter do not statistically differ from another at the 95% confidence level.

Table 6
Brand Name Pretest Two "Affect" Ratings

Brand Name	Mean Rating	Duncan's Test Results*	
Purity	.70	A	
Dutchblend	.40	A	
Supraline	.03	A	B
Easyride	.03	A	B
Guardline	-.53		B
Austin	-.58		B

* Brand ratings sharing the same letter do not statistically differ from another at the 95% confidence level.

Table 7
Brand Name Pretest Two "Quality" Ratings

Brand Name	Mean Rating	Duncan's Test Results*	
Supraline	.51	A	
Guardline	.43	A	
Purity	-.10	A	B
Easyrid	-.11	A	B
Austin	-.46		B
Dutchblend	-.82		B

* Brand ratings sharing the same letter do not statistically differ from another at the 95% confidence level.

Since there were no consistent ratings for any three brand name combination along the familiarity, affect and quality dimensions, a second level of analysis was required to isolate the three most similar brand names. Ideally, familiarity and affect scores should not differ among the chosen test brand name set, but these two dimensions were deemed less relevant than the quality ratings, and the believability ratings gleaned from the first brand name pretest. The familiarity and affect ratings were made out of context (i.e., subjects did not know that motor oil was the relevant product category). As a result, any influence of the brand name familiarity and affect associations on brand choice should be expected only in situations where no in-context differences were perceived among the motor oils (Baker et al., 1986; Barsalou, 1985; Harrison, 1977). The brand name counterbalancing present in the experimental design was designed to minimize any

systematic effect of this nature. The believability and quality ratings were made in the context of motor oil.

It was decided, then, to select the brand name set on the basis of the quality and believability ratings only. When these analyses were performed, Austin, Purity and Easyride emerged as the three brand name set with the fewest differences. A one way, within subjects ANOVA limited to these three names revealed significant differences along the familiarity ($F(2,71)=4.51$, $p<.016$) and affect dimensions ($F(2,71)=6.51$, $p<.003$), but not on quality ($F(2,71)=.26$, $p<.772$). The three brand names' scores on the believability measure from the first pretest were identical. Also, the standard deviations of the means for this three brand set on both the quality and the credibility measures were lower than any other three brand combination.

Table 8
Brand Name Rating Summary

Brand Name	Believability	Quality	Familiarity	Affect
Purity	-.67	-.10	.40	.70
Easyride	-.67	-.11	-.11	.03
Austin	-.67	-.46	-.26	-.58

Advertising Message Content Pretests

The objective of the second set of pretests was to isolate effective message content for each of the three message appeals. Affective reactions to several rock music songs about cars were tested as message stimuli for the "indifferent" appeal. A number of race car drivers were tested as endorsers for the "satisficing" appeal. Finally, a number of motor oil performance attributes were evaluated as message content for the "optimizing" appeal.

The music pretest. The purpose of this pretest was to identify the most appropriate musical background for the indifferent advertisement. Five popular songs about cars were tested: "Panama" by Van Halen, "Pink Cadillac" by Bruce Springsteen, "409" by The Beach Boys, "Red Corvette" by Prince and "Radar Love" by Golden Earring. Twenty eight subjects listened to a forty-five second segment of each of the five songs. The song presentation order was rotated across pretest groups. After the presentation, subjects rated the relative likability (i.e., the ability of the music to evoke positive, exhilarating feelings) of each song. The relative appropriateness of each song as a background for a motor oil advertisement was also measured. Immediately prior to the presentation, subjects were given the following introductory instructions:

> You are about to hear portions of several popular songs with themes about cars and driving. Each of these songs is being considered for use in an advertisement for motor oils. Please help us pick the best song for the advertisement. Think of the following as you listen to each song. First, note how the songs make you feel. The ideal song should excite and energize you in a very positive way. Second, think about how appropriate each song is as a musical background to a motor oil ad that is trying to appeal to people like yourself.

After the presentation, subjects compared the relative affect evoking ability and appropriateness of each candidate vis a vis a paired comparison methodology. Each song was compared directly against every other song on a "+3" to "-3" scale with +3 meaning song "X" is far superior and -3 meaning song "Y" is far superior on the tested dimension. The full text of the post-presentation instructions can be found in Appendix C.

A within subjects ANOVA with paired comparison follow-ups was used to analyze the data. A marginally significant difference was found among the musical selections along the likability dimension ($F(4, 139) = 2.1$, $p < .09$). As

Table 9 shows, however, a Tukey follow-up test revealed no significant difference between any of the selections at the 95% confidence interval.

Table 9
Music Likability Ratings

Musical Selection	Mean	Tukey's Studentized Range*
Panama	.80	A
Pink Cadillac	.13	A
409	-.25	A
Red Corvette	-.31	A
Radar Love	-.41	A

* Brand ratings sharing the same letter do not statistically differ from another at the 95% confidence level.

There were no significant differences found among the musical selections along the appropriateness dimension ($F(4, 139) = .66$, $p < .62$). The appropriateness ratings paralleled the likability ratings, except the variance in scores was smaller. Also, the average appropriateness score for "409" was more closely grouped with "Panama" and "Pink Cadillac".

Based on the results of this pretest, "Panama" and "Pink Cadillac" appeared to be the best two candidates. "Pink Cadillac" was chosen because it became easier to craft an advertisement using its rather than the "Panama" theme. The eventual background in the experiment, "409" was the third choice. The circumstances leading to the ultimate selection of "409" will be described later in this section.

Table 10
Music Appropriateness Ratings

Musical Selection	Mean	Tukey's Studentized Range*
Pink Cadillac	.25	A
Panama	.24	A
409	.14	A
Radar Love	-.25	A
Red Corvette	-.31	A

* Brand ratings sharing the same letter do not statistically differ from another at the 95% confidence level.

The spokesperson pretest. Since race car drivers are both celebrities and automotive experts, they seemed to be appropriate quality cues for the motor oil product category. This apparent natural fit has not gone unnoticed by the advertising industry. Drivers are commonly used to endorse various automotive products. The purpose of this pretest was to identify the most familiar race car driver in the subject pool for this experiment.

There were two parts to the pretest. First, in a free recall format, subjects were asked to list the names of five famous race car drivers. Second, in a recognition format, subjects were asked how confident they were that each of a set of 15 people were or were not race car drivers. Subjects rated each person on a 7-point scale, with "+3" meaning, "you are certain he is a race car driver" and "-3" meaning "you are certain that he is not a racer." Ten of the fifteen people on the list were race car drivers; the other five were personalities in other sports. The full text of instructions can be found in Appendix C.

The recognition scores were analyzed using a one-way within subject ANOVA with paired comparison follow-ups. The recall scores were held in reserve to be used as tie breakers. The full model ANOVA was highly significant ($F(10,305) = 20.2$, $p < .0001$). As Table 11 shows, a clear break in recognition test scores occurred between Al Unser and Bill Elliot. The Duncan paired comparison follow-up test showed no significant differences in recognition scores among the top six drivers at the 95% confidence interval.

Table 11
Race Car Driver Recognition Scores

Race Car Driver	Mean	Duncan's Test*
Mario Andretti	2.54	A
A.J. Foyt	2.39	A
Bobby Allison	2.33	A
Richard Petty	2.11	A B
Bobby Unser	2.04	A B
Al Unse	1.96	A B C
Bill Elliot	1.52	B C
Bobby Rahal	1.25	C D
Dan Gurney	.71	D
Parnelli Jones	-.25	E
Non-Racers**	-.76	E

* Brand ratings sharing the same letter do not statistically differ from another at the 95% confidence level.

** The non-racer mean is the average rating of five non-racers included in the test: Gary Fencik, Walter Payton, Bob Seagram, Pat Cash and Tommy Herr.

Any one of the top six drivers could have been used as the spokesperson for the satisficing appeal. The final decision was somewhat subjective. Results from the recall test were used to help break the six way tie from the recognition test. Four drivers, Mario Andretti, Richard Petty, A.J. Foyt and Al Unser were recalled by more than five subjects. Since Bobby Unser and Bobby Allison were not among the most highly recalled names, they were dropped from consideration. Richard Petty was dropped from the list because his name and car are closely associated with another product line, STP, and because it was felt that his image may lean too much towards "cracker" or "red neck" for the college subject pool. Mario Andretti and Al Unser were dropped because it was believed they may be more closely associated than A.J. Foyt with sophisticated Indy type cars, which bear little resemblance to road cars. As a result, A.J. Foyt was selected.

Table 12
Race Car Driver Recall Summary

	Free Recall*
Mario Andretti	15
Richard Petty	12
A.J Foyt	9
Al Unser	8

* Number of subjects recalling driver

Motor oil performance pretest. Of the message content pretests, this test was the most exploratory in nature. The purpose of the test was to identify the two benefits that members of the student subject pool most associated to motor oil. By selecting motor oil benefits in this manner, information was most likely to be congruent with existing knowledge and evaluative schemas and hence, least likely to be processed without counterargumentation (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). A search for familiar benefits was also undertaken to prevent information content from "overpowering" the advertising message involvement manipulation. Novel information is an antecedent of advertising message involvement and, hence, could lead to more elaborate processing than intended (Brock & Albert, 1976; Berlyne, 1970). Subjects were given the following instructions:

why do you buy motor oil? Motor oils can provide several benefits for automobiles. Some do a better job than others in providing these benefits. Some provide more benefits than others. In the space provided below, please list all the functions that motor oils can perform. Be as specific as possible.

After subjects listed benefits, they were asked to go back to their list and rank the personal importance of each benefit. The results of this pretest are presented in Table 13 below. Due to the more subjective, exploratory nature of this test, no analysis of statistically significant differences was applied. Two of the most mentioned benefits, "keeps engine running smoothly" and "lubricates engine" were generic, related and did not seem amenable to an optimizing advertising format.

The second and third most mentioned benefits, "increases gas mileage" and "reduces engine wear, extends engine life" were specific, independent of one another and very amenable to an optimizing advertising format. Their mean ranks were also as high as any of the other heavily mentioned, concrete benefits. For these reasons, they were chosen.

Table 13
Attribute Importance Test

Attribute	Free Recall*	Mean Rank**
Keeps engine running smoothly	54%	2.0
Increases gas mileage	39	2.0
Reduces engine wear, extends engine life	36	2.0
Lubricates engine	32	1.6
Cools Engine	32	2.0
Cleans engine, keeps it clean	25	3.6
Extreme temperature performance	11	2.7
Prevents engine freeze-up	11	1.5
Other	14	2.3

* Percentage of subjects who mentioned benefit
** Mean importance ranking by subjects who mentioned benefit

The results of this pretest were pertinent to both the satisficing and the optimizing message. In the satisficing message, the benefits were presented on an absolute level to facilitate satisficing choice decisions (e.g., extends engine life and promotes fuel efficiency). In the optimizing message, the benefits were presented on a relative level to facilitate optimizing choice decisions (e.g., extends engine live and promotes fuel economy better than any other motor oil).

After these pretests were completed, the three experimental advertisements were written and taped in a recording studio on the University of Florida campus. The "indifferent" appeal was designed to associate affect to the brand by using the song "Pink Cadillac" and by rapidly building brand name familiarity through heavy brand name repetition in the ad. The "satisficing" appeal was designed to associate quality cues to the brand by using A.J. Foyt as a spokesman and by linking good gas

mileage and long engine life, at an absolute level, to the brand. The "optimizing" appeal was designed to convince people that the advertised brand increases fuel economy and extends engine life better than other brands of motor oil. The full text of each radio spot can be found in Appendix A.

Advertising Performance Pretest

Other than the involvement manipulation check, this was the most important pretest of the study. It tested the ability of each advertisement to outperform the others at its designated level of information. The ability of the indifferent appeal to generate more positive feelings relative to the other two advertisements was tested; the ability of the satisficing appeal to better communicate quality cues than the other two appeals was measured, and the ability of the optimizing appeal to to better communicate superiority on each of the two advertised benefits, fuel economy and engine life, was measured; fifty-two subjects participated in the pretest. Upon arriving at the pretest, they were given the following preliminary instructions:

in a few moments you will listen to three advertisements for a new brand of motor oil. You will hear each advertisement twice. Pay very careful attention to each of the advertisement's themes and message information. After the presentation you will be asked to evaluate the effectiveness of each of the ads along three different dimensions: how they made you feel, their credibility, and the quality of their arguments. Please do not talk during the advertisement presentation, or while you are responding to the pretest questionnaire.

After the presentation, using a paired comparison methodology similar to the other pretests, subjects rated the advertisements on each of the three dimensions. Subjects were given specific instructions on the use of the paired comparison scales; then they rated the advertisements. The brand name Purity was used for each advertisement. The instructions for each of the three rated dimensions are below.

Optimizing Test
(A) Which of the three brand ads most persuaded you that Purity motor oil extends engine life better than other brands of motor oil?
(B) Which of the three brand ads most effectively persuaded you that Purity improves fuel economy better than other motor oils?

Satisficing Test:
Assume that you personally believe that motor oils differ in quality, but there is no way that motor oil can actually extend engine life or improve fuel economy. In this case, which of the three ads do you think was most persuasive?

Indifference Test:
In your opinion, which of the brand advertisements generated the most positive, most exhilarating feelings?

The results were analyzed using a one-way within subjects ANOVA with LSD paired comparison follow-ups. The results of this pretest are reported below in Tables 14A, 14B, 14C and 14D. Strong discrimination was evident on each of the three measured dimensions. The optimizing appeal, as required, outperformed both other appeals at the level of relative performance. Likewise, the satisficing appeal outperformed both other appeals at the level of quality cues. Unfortunately, the indifferent appeal did not evoke positive affect better than either other appeal. In fact, it was the least able of the three appeals to evoke positive affect.

Table 14A
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals' Abilities to Evoke Affect

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Satisficing	1.4	A
Optimizing	-.2	B
Indifferent	-1.3	C

$F(2,155) = 26.9$ $p<.0001$

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Table 14B
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals' Ability to Communicate Quality Cues

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Satisficing	1.4	A
Optimizing	.6	B
Indifferent	-2.0	C

F(2,155) = 67.17 p<.0001

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Table 14C
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals Ability to Communicate Relative Quality (Extend Engine Life)

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Optimizing	1.6	A
Satisficing	1.0	B
Indifferent	-2.6	C

F(2,155) = 200.4 p<.0001

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Table 14D
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals' Ability to Communicate Relative Quality (Improve Fuel Economy)

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Optimizing	1.7	A
Satisficing	.9	B
Indifferent	-2.4	C

F(2,155) = 180.8 p<.0001

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Given the inability of the indifferent appeal to outperform the other appeals on the affect dimension, a new indifferent appeal was developed. This time, the Beach Boys song, "409" was chosen for the musical background. The basic goal of

the appeal was the same, i.e., to generate strong affective associations to the brand name through musical association and the rapid building of brand name familiarity. The text of this advertisement can be found in Appendix A. A second pretest was conducted with no changes except the new indifferent appeal. Also, the sample size was smaller (30). The results are reported below in Tables 15A, 15B, 15C and 15D.

The excerpt from "409" provided a far better musical background than "Pink Cadillac." Using this song, the indifferent appeal significantly outperformed both other appeals on the affective dimension. Interestingly, the satisficing appeal failed to significantly outperform the other appeals on the quality cue level, although it had in the first pretest. The rating gap between the satisficing appeal and the optimizing appeal was as large in this pretest as in the first pretest (+.8), but the indifferent appeal performed much better. The optimizing appeal rated significantly better than the other appeals on fuel economy and significantly better than the indifferent appeal on extended engine life. It rated higher than the satisficing appeal on extend engine life, but due to the small sample size, this difference was not significant.

Except for the inability of the satisficing appeal to definitively outperform the other appeals as a quality cue, each appeal succeeded at its designated level of information. The failure of the satisficing appeal to better the indifferent appeal as a quality cue was worrisome but some if not all, of this inability was thought to be attributable to the ambiguous wording of the quality cue question. It did not clearly instruct respondents to choose the appeal with the most reassuring quality cue. Given this and the strong performance of the indifferent and optimizing appeals, the decision was made not to further refine the advertising message content.

Table 15A
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals' Ability to Evoke Affect

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Indifference	2.0	A
Satisficing	-.2	B
Optimizing	-1.8	C

F(2,89) = 50.6 p<.0001

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Table 15B
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals' Ability to Communicate Quality Cues

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Satisficing	.3	A
Optimizing	.2	A
Indifferent	-.5	A

F(2,89) = 1.26 p < .2917

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Table 15C
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals' Ability to Communicate Relative Quality (Extend Engine Life)

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Optimizing	1.2	A
Satisficing	.7	A
Indifferent	-2.1	B

F(2,89) = 33.81 p<.0001

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Table 15D
Evaluation of the Advertising Appeals' Ability to Communicate Relative Quality
(Improves Fuel Economy)

Advertising Appeal	Mean Rating*	LSD Paired Comparisons**
Optimizing	1.5	A
Satisficing	.5	B
Indifferent	-2.0	C

$F(2,89) = 39.76$ $p<.0001$

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from +3 to -3.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Involvement Manipulations

The final set of pretests measured the efficacy of the involvement manipulations. Three sets of pilots were conducted to refine both the involvement manipulations and the manipulation check measures. Modifications from the first draft to the final revision of the involvement instructions were very slight from pilot to pilot. In the advertising message involvement manipulation, some words were underlined to draw subjects' attention. In the brand response involvement manipulation, the time given to subjects to make their brand choice was modified to a level that allowed ample time to complete the task, but insufficient extra time to over rationalize the task and weaken the manipulations. The measures used to check the manipulations were changed from pilot to pilot, particularly the scales used to measure subjects' level of attention to the motor oil advertisements and the level of effort expended to make the motor oil brand choice. Scale measures that did not discriminate levels of involvement relative to other scales were removed or replaced. The changes in the scale measures, however, did not have a significant impact on pretest results. The four most discriminating scales for each manipulation were kept for the final pilot test. Given the absence of highly substantive instruction content change from pilot to pilot and the lack of effect of these changes, only the results of the final pilot are reported.

A total of sixty six subjects participated in the final pilot. The procedures applied to these subjects mirror the procedures for the main experiment as reported earlier in this chapter, except where otherwise noted below. Twenty-two subjects were assigned to each cell. Each of the nine experimental cells in the study was represented. The manipulation check results were analyzed using a one-way between subjects ANOVA with Duncan paired comparison follow-ups. The full text of the manipulation check instructions can be found in Appendix C. There were no changes in the manipulation checks from the final pretest to the main experiment.

AMI manipulation check. The first part of the advertising message involvement manipulation check measured subjects' level of attention to the motor oil advertisements. The instructions were:"Think back to the set of motor oil advertisements that you listened to yesterday. Using the scales below, describe your level of attention to the motor oil advertisements. That is, characterize the quality of your attention to these advertisements." Four seven point semantic differential scales were used: very motivated - very unmotivated, abnormally high - abnormally low, very intense - not at all intense, mattered a lot - didn't matter.

A principal components factor analysis using a varimax rotation was applied to these four scales. As Table 16 below reports, these scales loaded on a single dimension that explained 79% of the variance in scores. Since the measures loaded on a single dimension that may be called attentional intensity, each subject's ratings were summed to calculate an overall score. The attentional intensity means within each advertising message involvement condition are reported in Table 18A below. The mean in the Low AMI condition was significantly lower than the other two involvement conditions. The mean in the High AMI condition was

higher than in the moderate AMI condition, but using Duncan's Test for paired comparisons, this difference was not significant at the 95% confidence level.

Table 16
Factor Analysis of Attention to Advertising Scales

Attention Measure	Correlation to Attentional Intensity
Mattered a Lot - Didn't Matter	.91
Abnormally Low - Abnormally High	.89
Very Intense - Not at All Intense	.89
Very Motivated - Very Unmotivated	.88

Table 17A
Attentional Intensity Rating by AMI

Advertising Message Involvement	Mean Rating*	Duncan's Test**
High	16.5	A
Moderate	14.6	A
Low	9.9	B

$F(2,65) = 9.53$ $p<.0025$

* Ratings were made on a 28 point scale ranging from 1 to 28.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Five seven-point agree-disagree scales were used to measure three other outcomes of the advertising message involvement manipulation: preference formation at the advertising exposure occasion, message learning effort and message content comparison. Preference formation was measured by subtracting the score on scale "A" listed below from the score on scale "B":

Preference Formation:
(A) I decided which one of the motor oils I thought was the best while I was listening to the advertisements.
(B) I didn't decide which motor oil I liked the most until today when I was asked to choose one of them.

The primary purpose of the preference formation measure was to test the degree to which the experimental instructions differentially encouraged subjects to form brand preferences at the advertising exposure occasion. Since the relevance-accessibility model presumes that advertising does not typically lead to preference formation at the advertising exposure occasion, it was hoped that such a tendency would be weak in all three involvement conditions. This result occurred. As Table 18B below reports, scores in all three involvement conditions averaged above zero, suggesting that preferences were not typically formed at the advertising exposure occasion. The involvement manipulation did not create an expectation among subjects in any of the three conditions that a choice situation was forthcoming. Subjects in the low advertisement message involvement condition were significantly less likely to have formed a preference at the advertising exposure occasion than subjects in the other two conditions. Since they had been instructed to disregard the advertising, this result is not surprising.

Table 17B
Preference Formation at the Advertising Exposure Occasion by AMI

Advertising Message Involvement	Mean Rating*	Duncan's Test**
High	2.3	A
Moderate	1.5	A
Low	4.6	B

$F(2,65) = 6.32$ $p<..0032$

* Ratings were made on a 12 point scale ranging from -6 to +6.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Intent to learn message content was measured by subtracting the score on scale "C" below from scale "D".

Intent to Learn Message Content:
(C) Basically, I disregarded the advertisements.
(D) I tried to memorize the content of the motor oil advertisements.

As Table 17C shows, subjects in the low AMI condition were significantly more likely to disregard the advertising than subjects in the moderate and high AMI conditions. The lack of a statistically significant difference between the moderate and high AMI conditions was worrisome, but did not necessarily indicate a serious problem in the manipulation. Subjects in both conditions were given instructions that rewarded memorization. The nature of the memorization that was rewarded was different, however. In the high AMI condition, subjects were rewarded by memorizing message detail; in the moderate condition they were rewarded by memorizing the general themes only. This finding would have been more indicative of a problem if there were no strong directional differences between the two levels of AMI on the attentional intensity measure.

Table 17C
Message Learning Effort at the Advertising Exposure Occasion by AMI

Advertising Message Involvement	Mean Rating*	Duncan's Test**
High	2.3	A
Moderate	2.4	A
Low	-3.6	B

F(2,65) =32.6 p<..0001

* Ratings were made on a 12 point scale ranging from -6 to +6.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

The instructions for the agree-disagree scale that measured measured content comparison were, "I explicitly compared the content of the three motor oil advertisements as I listened to them." Subjects in the low AMI condition were significantly more likely to disagree with the statement than people in the

moderate and high AMI conditions. Again, there was no significant difference between the moderate and high AMI conditions. As before, the absence of a difference between the two higher AMI conditions is worrisome, but not a true indication of manipulation failure. Qualitatively, the nature of the comparisons made in the two conditions may have been different. In the high AMI condition, the comparisons may have been at the level of specific detail; in the moderate condition they may have been at a thematic level.

The basic results of this pretest were encouraging, particularly with respect to the primary measure of advertising message involvement, attentional intensity. Despite the absence of a statistically significant difference between the ratings in the high and the moderate AMI conditions, all scores were decidedly in the right direction. The scores suggested little or no difference between the moderate and the high AMI conditions on the secondary measures. However, the major motivation behind including the secondary measures was to diagnose where the manipulations went astray if attentional intensity did not vary by involvement condition. Given the positive results on the main attentional intensity measure, the decision was made not to modify the text of the advertising message involvement manipulations for the main experiment. Instead, key phrases in the instructions that highlighted the differences in the conditions were underlined for emphasis. The text of the manipulations with the highlighted areas added after the pretest were presented earlier in this chapter and can also be found in in Appendix B, which contains the main experimental questionnaire.

Table 17D
Message Content Comparisons at the Advertising Exposure Occasion by AMI

Advertising Message Involvement	Mean Rating*	Duncan's Test**
High	4.0	A
Moderate	4.2	A
Low	1.8	B

F(2,65) = 20.35 p<..0001

* Ratings were made on a 12 point scale ranging from -6 to +6.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

BRI manipulation check The first part of the brand response involvement manipulation check measured subjects' level of attention to the motor oil advertisements. The instructions were: "Think back to the set of motor oil choice you just made. Use the scales below to describe the amount of thought you were able to put into your motor oil choice. Consider only the effort that characterized your motor oil choice, not the effort you may have spent on the other questions that accompanied the motor oil question." Four seven point semantic differential scales were used: very motivated - very unmotivated, of strong concern - of no concern, meant a lot - meant nothing, mattered a lot - didn't matter.

A principal components factor analysis using a varimax rotation was applied to these four scales. As Table 18 below reports, these scales loaded on a single dimension that explained 84% of the variance in scores. Since the measures loaded on a single dimension that may be called decision process intensity, each subject's ratings were summed to calculate an overall score. The decision process intensity means within each brand response involvement condition are reported in Table 19A below. The mean in the Low BRI condition was significantly lower than the other two involvement conditions. The mean in the High BRI condition was higher than in the moderate BRI condition, but using Duncan's Test for paired comparisons, this difference was not significant at the 95% confidence level.

Table 18
Factor Analysis of Decision Process Intensity Scales

Decision Process Measure	Correlation to Decision Process Intensity
Mattered a Lot - Didn't Matter	.94
Of Strong Concern - Of No Concern	.93
Meant a Lot - Meant Nothing	.92
Very Motivated - Very Unmotivated	.88

Table 19A
Decision Process Intensity Rating by BRI

Brand Response Involvement	Mean Rating*	Duncan's Test**
High	16.2	A
Moderate	13.8	A
Low	8.9	B

$F(2,65) = 13.3$ $p<.0001$

* Ratings were made on a 28 point scale ranging from 1 to 28.

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Two seven-point agree-disagree scales were used to measure two other outcomes of the brand response involvement manipulation: advertising information recall effort and interbrand comparison effort. Advertising information recall effort was measured through the agree - disagree measure, "I expended considerable effort to recall all the advertising information I could about the motor oils before I made my choice." It was hoped that a statistically significant difference would emerge between each level involvement condition. The results were promising directionally, as brand response involvement increased, recall effort scores increased. Unfortunately, however, there were no significant differences between involvement conditions. The fact that subjects in the low BRI condition gave an average rating at the scale's midpoint was also worrisome.

Table 19B
Advertising Information Recall Effort by BRI

Brand Response Involvement	Mean Rating*	Duncan's Test**
High	4.5	A
Moderate	3.9	A
Low	3.4	A

F(2,65) = 2.24 p<..12

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from 1 to 7

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Interbrand comparison effort was measured by the following seven point agree - disagree scale, "I tried to compare the plusses and minuses of each advertised brand before I made my choice." Once again, it was hoped that significant differences would emerge between each level of brand response involvement. Once again, the results were directionally strong, but there was a significant difference between only the low and high BRI conditions.

Table 19C
Interbrand Comparison Effort by BRI

Brand Response Involvement	Mean Rating*	Duncan's Test**	
High	2.3	A	
Moderate	1.4	A	B
Low	-3.6		B

F(2,65) = 3.44 p<..05

* Ratings were made on a 7 point scale ranging from 1 to 7

** Appeals not sharing the same letter show a statistically significant rating difference at the 95% confidence level.

Overall, the brand response involvement manipulation was reasonably successful as indicated by the decision process intensity measure. All measures were in the right direction. The sample size in the pretest in part may be responsible for the lack of a significant difference between involvement conditions. There was concern, however, that too much effort was expended in the low BRI

condition to recall advertising information and compare brand alternatives. A perceived "test" environment was attributed as the major cause of this outcome. There was also concern that too little effort was expended in the high involvement condition to recall advertising and compare brand alternatives. This was also attributed to the test environment. Subjects were being asked to answer three consecutive questions, all of which they had to get right to win the aforementioned $5.00 reward. There was pressure to answer the motor oil question and move quickly to the other questions before time expired. This time pressure may have inhibited optimization.

Rather than change the instructions and questions in each BRI condition, the time allowed to complete the questions were changed. Rather than 90 seconds, the time permitted to complete the question set involving the motor oil brand choice was reduced to 60 seconds in each BRI condition. This was expected to be a sufficient amount of time to complete the task as instructed, but not enough time for subjects to proceed beyond the spirit of the instructions in order to achieve in the "test" environment. In the high BRI condition, the motor oil brand choice question became the only question subjects had to answer in 60 seconds. This gave them more time to think about their choice, if they so desired. Subjects answered the other two filler questions after they spent a full minute on the motor oil choice task. The brand response involvement manipulation instructions were presented in an earlier section of this chapter and are also in Appendix B.

This concludes Chapter Four. Chapter Five contains the main experimental results. The focus is on the test of the three experimental hypotheses. The chapter also includes checks of the final involvement manipulations and tests for the potential of demand-driven results.

CHAPTER 5
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will review the experimental results and discuss their implications as they pertain specifically to the three experimental hypotheses. Chapter Six will discuss the broader implications of the results and outline a plan to further test these implications.

Manipulation Checks

The manipulation check measures for both advertising message involvement and brand response involvement are identical to the measures used in the final pretest of the manipulations. Refer to Appendix B for the instructions and scales used to measure each.

All measures of both the advertising message involvement and the brand response involvement manipulations were input into a single factor analysis. This analytic procedure served two purposes. First, it minimized the total number of manipulation check measures by limiting the potential number of orthogonal dimensions associated to each manipulation. Second, it provided a means to assess the extent to which the two manipulations remained independent of one another. It was possible, for example, that the advertising message involvement manipulation could have dominated the brand response involvement manipulation, thus creating a demand effect.

The results of the factor analysis are reported in Table 20 below. Four dimensions emerged, two related to the advertising message involvement manipulation check and two related to the brand response involvement manipulation check. In no case, did any of the brand response involvement and advertising message involvement measures load on the same dimension. This supports the notion that the two manipulations were tapping, at least partially, independent behavioral dimensions.

The four dimensions that emerged from the factor analysis explained 73% of the total variance in the two involvement check measures. The numbers in each column of Table 20 report the correlation of the specific manipulation check measures to the dimension described by that column.

Table 20
Involvement Measure Factor Analysis Results

	Attentional Intensity	Preference Formation	Decision Process Intensity	Motivation to Optimize
AMI Measures*:				
A1	.79			
A2	.74			
A3	.74			
A4	.77			
B1	.75			
B2	.54			
B3	-.78			
B4		-.81		
B5		-.86		
BRI Measures*:				
A1			.78	
A2			.87	
A3			.86	
A4			.85	
B1				.83
B2				.77

* Listed letters/numbers correspond to the question numbers of the AMI and BRI measures as found in Appendix _ (e.g., question A1).

Advertising Message Involvement

The advertising message involvement manipulation checks measures loaded on two dimensions: attentional intensity and preference formation. Attentional intensity, by definition, was the primary measure of the manipulation. Seven of the nine AMI measures loaded on this dimension, while the other two loaded on preference formation.

The advertising message involvement manipulation appears to have been successful. Overall, there was a large significant effect of advertising message involvement on the attentional intensity measure ($F(2, 249) = 46.24$, $p < .0001$). Also, as Table 21 shows, the means differed significantly from one another in each of the three AMI conditions. These differences were in the expected direction and approximated the appropriate position on the attentional intensity scale. In the high AMI condition, the attentional intensity mean was significantly above the scale midpoint; in the moderate involvement condition, the mean was just slightly above the scale midpoint; in the low involvement condition, the mean was significantly below the scale midpoint. Based on these results, the AMI manipulation was successful.

Table 21
Attentional Intensity Means by Advertising Message Involvement

Involvement Condition	Attentional Intensity*	Duncan's Test**
High	28.5	A
Moderate	26.3	B
Low	20.5	C

* Mean of a scales ranging from"1 to 49" with "7" being the lowest possible score (assuming subject responded to all seven scales) and "49" being the highest possible score.

** Means with different letters are significantly different from one another at the 95% confidence level.

There was also a significant effect of the advertising message involvement on preference formation ($F(2,250)=8.86$, $p< .0002$). More importantly, there was no strong evidence that the manipulation led to overt preference formation in any of the advertising message involvement conditions. A positive score indicates a relative absence of preference formation at the advertising exposure occasion; as Table 2 shows, means in each of the three involvement conditions were positive. As might be expected, the tendency to form preferences was significantly lower in the low AMI condition than in either the moderate or high conditions. There was no significant difference between the moderate and the high AMI conditions.

Table 22
Preference Formation Means by Advertising Message Involvement

Involvement Condition	Preference Formation*	Duncan's Test**
High	1.1	A
Moderate	1.0	B
Low	3.0	C

* Mean of a scales ranging from "-6" to "6".
** Means with different letters are significantly different from one another at the 95% confidence level.

Brand Response Involvement. The brand response involvement manipulation check measures loaded on two dimensions from the factor analysis: decision process intensity and the motivation to optimize. Decision process intensity, by definition, was the primary measure of the manipulation. Four of the six BRI measures loaded on this dimension, the other two loaded on the motivation to optimize.

The brand response involvement manipulation also appears to be successful. Overall, there was a large significant effect of BRI on the decision process intensity measure ($F(2, 249) =16.80$, $p< .0001$). Also, as Table 23 shows, there was a significant difference in decision process intensity means across each of the three BRI conditions. These differences were in the expected direction, and. each mean

corresponded to an appropriate location on the measurement scale. In the high BRI condition, the mean was significantly above the scale midpoint; in the moderate involvement condition, the mean approximated the scale midpoint; in the low involvement condition, the mean was significantly below the scale midpoint. Based on these results, the BRI manipulation was successful.

Table 23
Decision Process Intensity Means by Brand Response Involvement

Involvement Condition	Decision Process Intensity*	Duncan's Test**
High	16.1	A
Moderate	14.4	B
Low	11.9	C

* Mean of a scales ranging from"1 to 28" with "4" being the lowest possible score (assuming subject responded to all seven scales) and "28" being the highest possible score.

** Means with different letters are significantly different from one another at the 95% confidence level.

There was also a significant effect of the brand response involvement manipulation on the dimension termed the motivation to optimize ($F(2,250)=23.5$, $p< .0002$). As Table 24 reports, all means were significantly different from one another in the expected direction. The tendency to report a decision process consistent with optimizing choice behavior was greatest in the high involvement condition and least in the low involvement condition.

Table 24
The Motivation to Optimize Means by Brand Response Involvement

Involvement Condition	Motivation to Optimize*	Duncan's Test**
High	9.0	A
Moderate	7.9	B
Low	5.9	C

* Mean of a scale ranging from "1" to "14".
** Means with different letters are significantly different from one another at the 95% confidence level.

Experimental Results

All three hypotheses were tested using simple chi-square analyses. A logit analysis supplemented the analysis of Hypothesis One, the most general test of the model. Logit analyses perform a simulated transformation of frequency data into interval data to allow multivariate interpretations. In this case, it was performed to test the presence of an interaction of advertising message involvement and brand response involvement on the dependent variables. The three dependent variables were the choice percentages associated with each of the three advertising appeals.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the primary dependent variable was changed from brand choice to message appeal choice. The results reported in the chapter use message appeal choice as the dependent variable. Appendix D includes the experimental results across all nine cells using the brand choice dependent variable. The pattern of results are the same with both dependent variables, but somewhat weaker using the brand choice dependent variable due to the disassociation problem some subjects encountered.

Hypothesis One.

Both advertising message involvement and brand response involvement directly influence the effect of advertising on brand choice.

Hypothesis One was supported. As Tables 25 and 26 reveal, with one exception, there were main effects of advertising message involvement and brand response involvement on each of the dependent variables. In no case was there a significant interaction of the two on choice. This latter result suggests that the effects of advertising message involvement and brand response involvement are independent and consistent across all three manipulated levels of involvement. The one contrary finding in the analysis was the absence of a significant effect of advertising message involvement on the effectiveness of the satisficing appeal. As Table 26 shows, however, the results are directionally consistent with expectations. The message appeal choice frequencies and percentages within each of the nine cells and across each level of AMI and BRI can be found in Appendix D.

The major implication of this finding is that advertising effects on brand choice need to be studied in the context of both the advertising exposure occasion and the brand response occasion. Theoretical perspectives such as the Availability Valence Hypothesis (Kiselius & Sternthal, 1983), the Principle of Higher Order Dominance (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984) and the Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) that study advertising effectiveness from the point of view of the advertising exposure occasion are incomplete.

Table 25
Main Model Test

Dependent Variable	Effect	Chi-Square	Significance
Optimizing Appeal	AMI Main Effect	$X^2 = 7.99$, df=2	$p < .0184$
Optimizing Appeal	BRI Main Effect	$X^2 = 9.75$, df=2	$p < .0076$
Optimizing Appeal	AMI x BRI Interaction	$X^2 = 3.63$, df=4	$p < .4580$
Satisficing Appeal	AMI Main Effect	$X^2 = 4.17$, df=2	$p < .1246$
Satisficing Appeal	BRI Main Effect	$X^2 = 6.81$, df=2	$p < .0333$
Satisficing Appeal	AMI x BRI Interaction	$X^2 = 2.64$, df=4	$p < .6204$
Indifferent Appeal	AMI Main Effect	$X^2 = 10.43$, df=2	$p < .0045$
Indifferent Appeal	BRI Main Effect	$X^2 = 15.29$, df=2	$p < .0005$
Indifferent Appeal	AMI x BRI Interaction	$X^2 = 4.32$, df=4	$p < .3650$

Table 26
Hypothesis One Main Effect Choice Frequencies

		Involvement Levels		
Advertising Appeal	Effect	Low*	Moderate	High
Optimizing Appeal	AMI	28%	21%	45%
Optimizing Appeal	BRI	24%	24%	46%
Satisficing Appeal	AMI	30%	46%	41%
Satisficing Appeal	BRI	29%	49%	38%
Indifferent Appeal	AMI	42%	33%	14%
Indifferent Appeal	BRI	47%	27%	16%

* Frequency data across both AMI and BRI and for each message appeal are available in Appendix D.

Hypothesis Two

When advertising message involvement and brand response involvement correspond, the form of advertising message content most likely to mediate brand choice is the one that focuses on the level of information typically associated with that degree of involvement.

Theoretically, Hypothesis Two maintains that advertising appeals will be more effective when they are designed to communicate at the level of information

consumers are expected to encode at the advertising exposure occasion and seek at the brand response occasion to discriminate brand alternatives. Empirically, Hypothesis Two predicted two experimental outcomes involving the experiment's involvement correspondence cells.

First, it predicted that within each of the three involvement correspondence cells, the advertising appeal the RAM theoretically associates with that cell will be effective significantly more often than the appeals not associated with the cell. In the low involvement correspondence cell, for example, the indifferent appeal was predicted to be effective significantly more often than either the optimizing or satisficing appeals. In the moderate involvement correspondence cell, the satisficing appeal was predicted to be effective most often, and in the high involvement correspondence cell, the optimizing appeal was predicted to be effective most often.

The second result implied by Hypothesis Two was that each of the three advertising appeals would perform significantly better in the involvement correspondence cell to which the RAM associates it than in either of the other correspondence cells. The indifferent appeal was expected to perform significantly better in the low involvement correspondence cell than in the other two involvement correspondence cells; the satisficing appeal was expected to perform better in the moderate involvement correspondence cell than in the other two cells; the optimizing appeal was expected to perform significantly better in the high involvement correspondence cell.

Both of the empirical results predicted by Hypothesis Two were supported. Each advertising appeal was significantly more effective in its involvement correspondence cell than were the other appeals. Each advertising appeal was also more effective, at least directionally, in its theoretically assigned correspondence cell than in the other correspondence cells.

Within correspondence cell effectiveness. Each appeal was effective at least 50% of the time in its respective correspondence cell; each appeal was effective significantly more often than the other two appeals. In the low involvement correspondence cell, the primary chi-square test was significant (X^2 = 6.49, p< .04, df=2). Follow-up chi-square analyses confirmed that the indifferent appeal was effective significantly more often than the optimizing appeal (X^2 = 5.21, p< .03, df=1). It was also effective more than the satisficing appeal, but this difference was only marginally significant (X^2 = 3.71, p< .06, df=1). In the moderate involvement correspondence cell, the primary chi-square and both relevant follow-up tests were significant (primary test: X^2 = 10.03, p< .01; df =2; satisficing versus indifferent: X^2 = 4.56, p<.04, df=1; satisficing versus optimizing: X^2 = 8.66, p< .01, df=1). Likewise, the primary chi-square and relevant follow-up tests were all significant in the high involvement correspondence cell (primary test: X^2 = 20.18, p< .01, df=2; optimizing versus satisficing: X^2 = 8.24, p<.01, df=1; optimizing versus indifferent: X^2=18.2, p<.01, df=1).

Table 27
Choice Frequencies Within the Three Correspondence Cells

	Advertising Appeal***			
Correspondence Cell	Indifferent	Satisficing	Optimizing	Chi-Square**
Low AMI - BRI	53%	28*%	19%	X^2 =6.49, p< .04
Moderate AMI - BRI	12%	56%	32%	X^2 = 0.03, p<.01
High AMI - BRI	0%	36%	64%	X^2 =20.18,p< .01

* Not significantly lower than the indifferent appeal choice percentage at the 95% confidence interval.
** Two degrees of freedom
*** Frequency data across both AMI and BRI and for each message appeal are available in Appendix D.

Between correspondence cell effectiveness. The pattern of results support Hypothesis Two but in some cases, only directionally. As Table 28 shows, each of the primary chi-square analyses was significant at least at the 95% confidence level. All of the follow-up analyses were in the predicted direction, but two of the six tests did not achieve significance. The indifferent appeal was effective significantly more often in its correspondence cell than in the high involvement correspondence cell (X^2 = 21.65, p< .01, df=1). It was also effective more often in its correspondence cell than in the moderate correspondence cell, but this difference did not achieve significance (X^2 = 2.25, p<.14, df=1). The satisficing appeal was effective more often in its correspondence cell than than the low involvement correspondence cell (X^2 = 4.56, p< .04, df=1) or the high involvement correspondence cell, but the latter difference did not reach statistical significance (X^2 = 1.88, p< .18, df=1). All tests of the relative efficacy of the optimizing appeal in the high involvement correspondence cell relative to the other two correspondence cells were highly significant (primary test: X^2 = 24.78, p<.01, df=2; as compared to the moderate involvement correspondence cell: X^2 = 17.2, p< .01, df=1; as compared to the low correspondence cell: X^2 = 12.14, p<.01, df=1).

Table 28
Choice Frequencies Across the Three Correspondence Cells

	Involvement Correspondence Cell***			
Advertising Appeal	Low - Low	Mod. - Mod.	High - High	Chi-Square**
The Indifferent Appeal	53%	32%*	0%	X^2 =34.50, p< .01
The Satisficing Appeal	28%	56%	36%*	X^2 =6.03, p< .05
The Optimizing Appeal	19%	12%	64%	X^2 =24.78, p< .01

* At the 95% confidence level, choice frequency of appeal not significantly lower in this cell than in correspondence cell.

** Two degrees of freedom

*** Frequency data across both AMI and BRI and for each message appeal are available in Appendix D.

Hypothesis Three

Message content that focuses on one of the three levels of information is more likely to mediate choice when both advertising message involvement and brand response involvement correspond to that level of information than when only advertising message involvement or brand response involvement, or neither corresponds to that level of information.

Hypothesis Three states that an advertising message appeal is most likely to be effective when involvement at the advertising exposure occasion facilitates its encoding and involvement at the brand response occasion facilitates its use in the brand response process. In other words, an advertising message appeal will be most effective when advertising message involvement and brand response involvement correspond to the level of information in the appeal, than if not. Unlike the empirical tests of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2, the analysis of Hypothesis 3 required the use of the empirical results in all nine cells of the experimental design. The empirical test of Hypothesis 3 compared the effectiveness of each of the advertising appeals in its theoretical correspondence cell relative to those cells where either advertising message involvement or brand response involvement matched the correspondence cell level and those cells where neither advertising message involvement or brand response involvement matched the correspondence cell level. For example, the effectiveness of the indifferent appeal in its involvement correspondence cell (i.e., low AMI - low BRI) was compared to its average effectiveness in all those cells where either AMI or BRI was low and to its effectiveness in all those cells where neither AMI or BRI were low.

As Table 29 shows, Hypothesis 3 was supported. Overall, advertising appeals were significantly more effective in the cells where their accessibility and relevance were expected to be optimized, i.e., their involvement correspondence cells, than in those cells where deficits were expected. Like Hypothesis 2, the results of the primary chi-square test were significant for each of the three advertising appeals. As with Hypothesis 2, paired comparison follow-up tests directionally supported the hypothesis in every case, but two of the six did not reach statistical significance.

The indifferent appeal was significantly more effective in its correspondence cell than in the average of those cells where neither AMI or BRI were low (X^2 = 18.57, p< .01, df=1). Although the results were in the right direction, the appeal was not effective significantly more often in its correspondence cell than in those cells where either AMI or BRI was low (X^2= 1.87, p < .18, df=1).

The satisficing appeal was significantly more effective in its correspondence cell than in all those cells where neither AMI or BRI were moderate (X^2 =6.23, p<.02, df=1), but the hypothesis was only directionally supported when tested against those cells where either AMI or BRI was high (X^2 = 1.42, p< .24, df=1).

All tests of the optimizing appeal were significant (primary test: X^2 = 23.41, p< .01, df=2; "both versus one": X^2= 8.85, p<.01, df=1; "both versus none": X^2 = 21.59, p< .01, df=1; "one versus none": X^2 = 3.89, p< .05,.df=1). The optimizing appeal performed significantly better in the high involvement correspondence cell than in the average of those cells where either AMI or BRI was high, and in those cells where neither AMI or BRI was high.

Table 29
Choice Frequencies by Degree of Predicted Involvement Correspondence

	Degree of Involvement Correspondence			
Advertising Appeal	Both	One	Neither	Chi-Square**
The Indifferent Appeal	53%	38%*	16%	X^2 = 23.70
The Satisficing Appeal	56%	42%*	31%	X^2 = 8.13
The Optimizing Appeal	64%	33%	20%	X^2 = 23.41

* Differences with the "Both" cell are not significant at the 95% confidence level
** Two degrees of freedom

Pitting the Experimental Results Against Other Communication Models

The Availability-Valence Hypothesis (Kisielius & Sternthal, 1984) and the Principle of Higher Level Dominance (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984) study communication effects from the perspective of the advertising exposure occasion.

The Elaboration Likelihood Model acknowledges the role of the brand response occasion by postulating that advertising message involvement is a direct function of brand response involvement, but the model assumes that brand attitudes formed at the advertising exposure occasion drive behavior at the brand response occasion. Thus, it too is bound to the advertising exposure occasion. Since these models are all tied to the advertising exposure occasion, they would predict different experimental outcomes than the RAM. The results they would predict are consistent with the main effects of AMI found in the study, but they cannot account for the effects of BRI.

According to the Availability-Valence Hypothesis (Kisielius & Sternthal, 1984), since processing capacity is limited, people cannot use all available information in memory to make brand judgements. Instead, evaluation is a function of that subset of information in brand memory that becomes salient at the brand response occasion. The valence of the accessible information determines the favorableness of the judgment rendered. After capacity is filled, judgments are rendered; then, additional information fills capacity. This information may raise, lower, or have no effect on the initial judgment.

Differences between the Availability-Valence Hypothesis (AVH) and the Relevance-Accessibility Model lead to different experimental predictions. The AVH acknowledges only those antecedents of informational salience that are linked to the advertising exposure occasion, including cognitive elaboration and recency. The effect of consumer motivated internal search at the brand response occasion is not discussed. It also does not explicitly acknowledge the discounting role of perceived informational relevance at the brand response occasion (i.e., information may be accessed and discounted as irrelevant). Thus, accessibility is implied to be purely a function of consumer behavior at the advertising exposure occasion and <u>all</u> accessed valenced information is presumed to have an effect on the evaluation

outcome. Given this, the AVH, as conceptualized, would not predict any choice differences across brand response involvement conditions. Since the precise role of advertising message involvement on evaluation is not explained, specific AVH predictions in the context of this experimental design are difficult to make, but most likely some type of main effect of AMI would be expected. The model does not contain elements that would predict a main effect of brand response involvement or an AMI - BRI interaction.

According to the Principle of Higher Level Dominance (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984), advertising message involvement determines the level of processing an advertising message receives, which in turn mediates the level of information that is most efficiently encoded into brand memory at the advertising exposure occasion. Advertising-based evaluation is mediated by the highest level of information encoded because this information receives the most processing at the advertising exposure occasion, and, as a result, is more accessible at the time of evaluation. The perceived relevance of information at the advertising exposure occasion is a major determinant of the level of processing that the information receives, but like the AVH, the brand response occasion is not considered explicitly. Therefore, the PHLD, as currently conceptualized, would make the choice predictions shown in Table 30 below. There would be a main effect of advertising message involvement only. The PHLD does not contain elements that would predict a main effect of BRI on choice or an AMI - BRI interaction. At the sensory level of processing, the affective appeal would be most successful; at the comprehension level of processing, the quality cue appeal would be most successful, and at the integration level of processing the relative performance appeal would be most successful.

Table 30
Experimental Results Predicted by the Principle of Higher Level Dominance

		BRI		
		Indifferent	Satisficing	Optimizing
AMI	Sensory	C	C	C
	Comprehension	B	B	B
	Integration	A	A	A

The Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981) recognizes that expected brand response involvement is the primary mediator of consumers' level of processing at the advertising exposure occasion and, hence, is the primary determinant of whether central or peripheral processing will occur. However, the model assumes that brand attitudes formed at the advertising exposure occasion mediate subsequent brand choice decisions. In essence, advertising effectiveness occurs at the advertising exposure occasion, not because accessibility is determined there as the Availability-Valence Hypothesis and the Principle of Higher Order Dominance postulate, but because that is when brand attitudes are formed.

The ELM explicitly recognizes two brand response categories, i.e., the "peripheral" and "central" routes to persuasion. These most closely correspond with the RAM's satisficing and optimizing categories, respectively. As a result, the ELM's choice predictions relating to the experimental design are restricted in Table 31 below to these categories and the levels of advertising message involvement and brand response involvement with which they are associated. The ELM predicts the same outcome as the PHLD, but for different reasons. The PHLD predictions are based on the effects of advertising message involvement on information accessibility; the ELM predictions are based on the effects of advertising message involvement on attitude formation outcomes at the advertising exposure occasion. Neither recognizes an independent moderating role of the brand response occasion on choice.

Table 31
Experimental Predictions Based on the Elaboration Likelihood Model

		BRI		
		Indifferent	Satisficing	Optimizing
AMI	Comprehension	B	B	B
	Integration	A	A	A

All three of these approaches, particularly the AVH and the ELM can account for the main effects of advertising message involvement observed in this study. All three also, however, offer an incomplete picture of advertising effects because they do not specifically account for independent effects at the brand response occasion. The main effects of BRI on message appeal choice, as reported in Tables 25 and 26, reveal the limitations of these approaches. The RAM, by accounting for effects of the brand response occasion, provides a richer, more complete portrayal of advertising effects.

The AVH, the ELM and the Principle of Higher Level Dominance would not have predicted any significant effects of brand response involvement on message choice appeal. As Table 32 illustrates, several significant effects did occur. The optimizing appeal performed significantly better when brand response involvement was high than when it was either low (X^2 = 8.21, $p < .01$, df=1) or moderate (X^2 = 6.20, $p < .015$, df=1). The indifferent appeal performed significantly better when brand response involvement was low than when it was either moderate (X^2 = 6.01, $p < .02$, df=1) or high (X^2=16.6, $p < .01$, df=1). The satisficing appeal performed significantly better when BRI was moderate than when it was low (X^2 = 6.66, $p<.01$, df=1); it also performed better when it was moderate then when it was high, but this difference did not reach statistical significance (X^2 = 2.10, $p<.27$, df=1). The reader should refer back to Tables 20 and 21 and to Appendix D for the relevant data.

Table 32
Effects of Brand Response Involvement on Appeal Effectiveness

	Brand Response Involvement		
	Low	Moderate	High
Message Appeal:			
Optimizing	A	A	B
Satisficing	A	B	A/B
Indifferent	A	B	B

* The effectiveness of any given appeal is significantly different between levels of involvement at least the 95% confidence level if they do not share the same letter.

Demand Effects

A series of questions were asked to test the likelihood of experimental demand effects. Subjects were asked when, if ever, during the course of the experiment they concluded that the primary purpose of the study was related to the motor oil advertisements. They were asked the extent to which they thought there was a hidden purpose of the study not explained by the instructions. They were asked the extent to which they thought the experiment had more to do with the advertisements than what the experimental instructions stated, and they were asked if they thought the motor oil advertisements were more important to the experiment than the clothing store advertisements.

As the results below show, there was no support for a demand effect point of view. There is little evidence that even suggests that subjects were aware that the experiment dealt primarily with the motor oil advertisements. Regarding the perceived preeminence of the motor oil advertisements, subjects were asked the following:

Besides studying the potential appeal of the Lone Ranger and other old time radio shows, we are very interested in learning about your perceptions of the advertisements you heard yesterday. In fact, the major focus of the experiment is

actually concerned with your reactions to the advertising. You will be asked a series of questions about the motor oil advertisements. Please indicate when, if ever, you thought the experiment was predominantly concerned with the motor oil advertisements.

a. Yesterday
b. Today when I made my motor oil choice
c. Just now

The vast majority of subjects, 70%, answered, "just now." Only 18% of respondents answered "yesterday" and just 12% said, "Today, when I made my motor oil choice." Based on this finding, fewer than one in five subjects were in a position to even attempt to derive the purpose of the experiment prior to the brand response involvement manipulation.

Subjects were also asked to agree or disagree with the following statements about the experiment.

1. As I listened to the show yesterday, I didn't think about any "hidden purpose to the study. I simply followed instructions."
2. "As I listened to the programming yesterday, I thought the experiment was more concerned with my reactions to the advertising than the experimental instructions stated."
3. I entered the experiment today thinking that the motor oil advertisements were more important than the advertisements for the clothing stores.

The means for the first two questions indicate that there was a small overall tendency for subjects to believe the experiment dealt more with the advertising than what the instructions stated, but that there was no aggregate tendency to think about any hidden purpose to the study as it unfolded. The perception of a hidden purpose did vary by advertising message involvement ($F(2,250)=3.70$, $p< .0261$). Subjects in the high AMI condition were significantly more likely to perceive a hidden purpose than subjects in the low AMI condition. Regardless of condition, however, there was no group with a mean score on the question that indicated any strong concern with a "hidden purpose".

The mean for the third question indicates no aggregate perception that the motor oil advertisements were more important to the study than the clothing store advertisements. Again there were significant differences in the mean ratings across levels of advertising message involvement ($F(2,250)=3.27$, $p< .0398$, $df=1$), but no group displayed a mean above the scale midpoint.

Table 33
Demand Effect Means

	Overall Mean	Low AMI	Moderate AMI	High AMI
1. Hidden Purpose	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.8
2. Advertising Emphasis	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.7
3. Motor Oil Emphasis	3.1	3.4	3.0	2.7

* Means derived from a 7 point scale with "7" meaning "strongly agree" and "1" meaning "strongly disagree"

The implications of these results is that the experimental results were not demand driven. The vast majority of subjects had no idea that the primary purpose of the experiment was related to the motor oil experiments. There was no aggregate belief that the experiment had a hidden agenda not discussed in the experimental instructions. And, although there was a tendency for subjects to believe that the experiment was more involved with the advertising than with the radio show, subjects did not tend to believe that the motor oil advertisements were more important to the experiment than the clothing store advertisements.

Summary

The results of the experiment are highly consistent with the theoretical framework offered by the Relevance-Accessibility Model of advertising effectiveness. They are consistent with The Principle of Brand Associate Relevance: when brand

response involvement was low, the indifferent appeal was most successful; when it was moderate, the satisficing appeal was most successful; when it was high, the optimizing appeal was most successful. The results are also consistent with The Principle of Advertising Generated Brand Associate Accessibility. When advertising message involvement was low, the indifferent appeal was most successful, which implies that affect was highly accessible; when it was moderate, the satisficing appeal was most effective; when it was high, the optimizing appeal was most effective.

Most importantly, the results were highly consistent with the Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution, which supports the notion that advertising effectiveness is a function of the synergy between an advertising message, advertising message involvement and brand response involvement. To maximize advertising effectiveness, advertising messages must be designed to (1) communicate at the level of information consumers are expected to use to discriminate brand alternatives at the brand response occasion as predicted by brand response involvement and (2) engender a level of advertising message involvement that corresponds to the predicted level of brand response involvement. Models of consumer behavior that ignore the interrelationship between message content, advertising message involvement and brand response involvement are incomplete.

CHAPTER 6
GENERAL DISCUSSION

Theoretical Contribution

The major contribution of this dissertation is the theoretical framework it provides to study the issue of advertising effectiveness. This framework incorporates recent insights from several research streams including attitude and choice theory (e.g., Feldman & Lynch, 1987; Biehal & Chakravarti, 1986), consumer elaboration and involvement (e.g., Wright, 1973, 1980; Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981), automaticity and affect (e.g., Zajonc, 1980; Bargh, 1984; Bierley & McSweeney, 1986), and the role of intervening hypothetical constructs such as attitude toward the ad (e.g., Mitchell & Olson, 1981, Lutz, 1985; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989). The contribution of the RAM framework lies in its attempt to derive a series of theoretical principles and propositions that reconcile and integrate findings from these various streams of research. The RAM is built around the following theoretical building blocks.

First and foremost, is the premise that consumer behavior at the brand response occasion plays a profound role in advertising effectiveness. Behavior at the advertising exposure occasion contributes to advertising effectiveness, but does not determine it. The primary implication is that complete models of advertising effectiveness must incorporate behavior at both the advertising exposure occasion and the brand response occasion.

Second, the RAM proposes that stable brand attitudes are not reliable mediators of advertising effectiveness because (1) they do not necessarily, perhaps even typically exist(Lastovicka & Bonfield, 1982); (2) if they exist, they are not necessarily used by consumers to make brand choice decisions (Feldman & Lynch, 1987; Ray et al., 1973); and (3) advertising does not often mediate their formation (Krugman, 1965; Smith & Swinyard, 1983). Instead, consumers use the informational antecedents of brand attitude to make brand choices. In order for advertising to be effective, advertising-supplied information must be at least as accessible and relevant at the brand response occasion as competing information. So, rather than affect brand attitudes at the advertising exposure occasion, the goal of advertising should be to efficiently communicate information that can be cued to retrieval at the brand response occasion. Relatedly, advertising effectiveness must be assessed through measures of message learning, not measures of attitude change. Essentially, the RAM presumes that brand attitude is a theoretical construct with no more or less significance than any other brand associate. Its value is a function of its relevance and accessibility at the brand response occasion.

Third, the RAM identifies three levels of information that can dominate the brand choice process, i.e., affect, quality cues and relative performance information, and links them to three macro "brand response routes": indifference, satisficing and optimizing. This perspective extends approaches that focus on dual response routes (Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann, 1983; Mitchell, Gardner & Russo, 1983; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989). To be effective, advertising must communicate the appropriate level of information.

It should be noted that the value of these three brand response routes is more heuristic than theoretically "pure." There is undoubtedly more than three brand response routes and three types of information and combinations of information

types available to consumers at the brand response occasion. Involvement is a continuum, not three discrete levels. Its effects are expected to vary all along that continuum. However, the three levels of information and the three brand response routes do have strong theoretical and empirical support. They are a part of the picture, they just are not the whole picture.

Fourth, the RAM links the accessibility and relevance of each level of information to consumer involvement. At the advertising exposure occasion, advertising message involvement (AMI) determines the level of information that consumers are most likely to encode sufficiently in memory to enable retrieval at the brand response occasion. At the brand response occasion, brand response involvement (BRI) determines the level of information that consumers are most likely to seek to discriminate brand alternatives. As stated by the Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution, the major implication is that advertising effectiveness is most likely to be maximized when message content, AMI and BRI correspond. When message content, AMI and BRI do not correspond, advertising is less likely to directly mediate choice because breakdowns in accessibility, relevance or both will occur.

Finally, it should be noted that aspects of the RAM framework can generalize beyond the context of advertising. Specifically, the Principle of Brand Associate Relevance can be applied to decision-making in general. The principle states that, ceteris paribus, different brand response routes are perceived to be most relevant and, hence, are invoked along the brand response involvement continuum. At the high end of the brand response involvement continuum, consumers optimize at the brand response occasion. In the middle of the brand response involvement continuum, consumers satisfice at the brand response occasion. At the low end of the brand response involvement continuum, consumers act indifferently at the brand response occasion.

Empirical Contribution

Experimental Results

The empirical test of the RAM provided initial support for the model's assertions, but more work is needed to replicate and extend these findings. The results pertaining to the test of Hypothesis One unequivocally support the foundation of the RAM framework, i.e., the premise that advertising effectiveness is determined at both the advertising exposure occasion (AEO) and the brand response occasion (BRO). Results consistently showed strong, significant effects of brand response involvement on message appeal choice at the brand response occasion.

The results are consistent with the notion that information accessibility was primarily affected at the AEO and that information relevance was primarily affected at the BRO. The precise causes of the significant main effects of involvement on brand choice at the AEO and the BRO, however, cannot be ascertained because they were neither directly observable or traced. Although no alternate explanations are apparent, others may be tenable.

Since there were significant effects of brand response involvement on message appeal choice, the perspective that brand attitude formation at the advertising exposure does not typically mediate brand choice was also supported. It can be argued, however, that the experimental procedure encouraged message content memorization, which may have inhibited attitude formation. A stronger test of this perspective is possible and will be discussed in the next section of this chapter. There was also support for the assertion that three levels of information mediate choice behavior. Although, it was not possible to definitely confirm that each message appeal mediated choice at its intended level of information (i.e., it was not possible to confirm that the indifferent appeal mediated choice through

the communication of affect), alternative explanations are not apparent, particularly given the experimental pretest results. There is less evidence for the operation of the model's three brand response routes. Establishing their operation will be difficult since process cannot be directly observed (See Feldman & Lynch, 1988).

Finally, through the tests of Hypotheses Two and Three, the Principle of Optimal Advertising Contribution was strongly supported. Advertising effectiveness was maximized when message content, AMI and BRI all corresponded. Each message appeal performed significantly better in its involvement correspondence cell than did other appeals and each message appeal performed better, although not significantly in some cases, in its involvement correspondence cell than it did in other experimental cells.

Method

The involvement manipulations in the experiment worked well, perhaps better than the manipulation checks indicated. It is important, however, that manipulation standards be set for both AMI and BRI that focus on exclusively involvement's antecedents, not its moderators, e.g., ability and opportunity, and definitely not one or more of its ultimate consequences (e.g., the level of information encoded at the advertising exposure occasion, the level of information used to discriminate brands at the brand response occasion). The manipulations used in this experiment are arguably superior to ones in other studies that apparently manipulated the ultimate consequences of involvement rather than the construct itself (e.g., Mitchell, Gardner & Russo, 1983; Gardner, 1986). However, the manipulations in this experiment were not "pure" either because they employed more than antecedents. Although the manipulations did not direct people to any of the three levels of information at either the advertising

exposure occasion or the brand response occasion, the AMI manipulation did, however, explicitly instruct people to pay differential attention to advertising and the BRI manipulation did instruct people to choose the best brand (high BRI), avoid choosing a bad brand (moderate BRI) or choose a brand they like (low BRI). For this reason, the results cannot be used as strong evidence that high BRI leads to optimizing. They can be used to conclude that optimizing leads to the use of relative performance information.

In experiments using multiple test brands, particularly when these brands are new or fictional, disassociation of the message from the brand name is a problem. If brand choice is used as the dependent variable when it is in fact a surrogate for the true dependent variable (e.g., message appeal choice in this experiment), experimental results, at best, will be hampered by increased unsystematic error and, at worst, will be biased by effects of systematic error (e.g., if disassociation of the brand name from the message is related to one or more of the independent variables). The solution is to use a measure of the true dependent variable, the information used to make the choice decision, not a surrogate.

Applied Contribution

Message Strategy Development

Theoretically and empirically, the RAM supports the perspective that a primary goal of advertising must be to affect the choice process at the brand response occasion. To be effective, advertising must contribute to the process that discriminates brand alternatives and leads to the formation of a relative advantage that motivates behavior. Strategically, the RAM provides advertisers

specific guidelines for developing message strategy. The unique contribution of the model is in its ability to identify the qualitative level of information that is expected to discriminate alternatives at the brand response occasion.

Advertisers should employ a two-stage strategic process to develop message strategy. In the first stage, the brand response route, as predicted by brand response involvement, must be identified. In the second stage, the specific message content within the prescribed route must be determined. That is, if it is established that a brand's consumer target market is optimizing, then the most important relative performance benefits of the brand to this target market need to be identified. Similarly, if consumers are satisficing, then the most reassuring quality cues must be found. If "within route" analytic procedures such as benefit segmentation are performed without first identifying the operative brand response route, then advertising may communicate information at an inappropriate informational level. For example, advertisers may conduct research to identify relative performance advantages when their target market is satisficing. In this scenario, advertising is likely to be ineffective because the right information at the wrong level will be communicated in advertising.

Advertising Ineffectiveness

The size of the expected gap between AMI and BRI may be used (1) to make fundamental marketing mix decisions (e.g., the use of advertising) and (2) to decide if the goal of advertising is to affect choice or consideration. As the expected gap between AMI and BRI widens, the probability of advertising effectiveness decreases, because the probability that advertising will lead to the sufficient encoding of information perceived to be relevant at the brand response occasion declines. In this situation, it may be wise for advertisers to emphasize other elements of the marketing mix (e.g., sales promotion, packaging).

All things equal, relevant information at the point of purchase has an advantage over advertising, because it is more accessible. In purchase situations where a great deal of relevant information is readily available to consumers at the brand response occasion and consumers are expected to use such information, then marketing dollars may be better invested at supplying point of purchase informational support rather than advertising support. This is particularly true when there are no "hidden" relevant benefits that point of purchase information could not as effectively communicate (e.g., lifestyle identification). If it is used in these situations, advertising may be better used to influence consideration, motivate point of purchase information search, or "bias" information search and interpretation processes (Bargh, 1984; Fazio, 1986) rather than to directly affect choice.

Measuring Advertising Effectiveness

Since the RAM provides guidelines for identifying the informational level expected to discriminate brand alternatives, it de facto provides direct guidance on appropriate measures of advertising effectiveness. For example, if consumers are expected to be indifferent at the brand response occasion, then affective reactions to the advertising should be measured. Measures tapping the effects of information not expected to be used at the brand response occasion should be avoided. Equally as important, if simulated choice measures are taken in a pretest situation, it is critical that the level of BRI expected at the brand response occasion be facilitated or simulated during the pretest. Otherwise, ratings of these dependent variables are likely to be derived from an inappropriate informational level. The result could be grossly over or under-rated effectiveness.

Advertising Message Design

If one adopts the perspective that salient message information at the brand response occasion, not brand attitudes formed at the advertising exposure occasion, determines advertising effectiveness, then execution design (i.e., packaging a message in a manner that will maximize its accessibility) becomes as paramount a concern of advertisers as message design (identifying the information that will maximize the relevance of the advertising). Since the right message content cannot lead to advertising effectiveness unless that content is accessed at the brand response occasion, more emphasis needs to put on designing advertising messages that are memorable and that create a strong link between the message and the brand name. Currently, applied market research is typically limited to the issue of message strategy. Execution design research is equally important.

More attention also needs to be given to the use of memory cues at the point of purchase that will facilitate the retrieval of advertising message content. Execution design strategy is equally as important as message strategy.

Future Research

Chapter Three presented the broad theoretical structure of the RAM. Research addressing each of the model's principles and propositions is needed. Each portion of the model presents numerous research opportunities, only some of the more molar issues will be discussed here.

An important issue is that of the role of brand attitude formation at the advertising exposure occasion. It is a given that advertising can lead to the formation of brand attitudes, which in turn can mediate choice behavior at a later

time. The RAM proposes that this process is not dominant, particularly when there are significant differences between the advertising occasion and the brand response occasion (i.e., involvement, brand alternatives, product information) (See Feldman & Lynch, 1988). An experiment that manipulates AMI, BRI, attitude formation at the advertising exposure occasion and perhaps the presence of some new information at the brand response occasion could test the extent to which advertising message content will supercede the use of advertising-generated brand attitudes at the brand response occasion. The RAM predicts effects of brand attitudes on choice only if they are accessible and relevant. That is, the RAM gives no special theoretical advantage of brand attitudes over other types of information.

Another interesting issue is the efficacy of advertising at different levels of brand response involvement. Petty and Cacioppo (1981) and Greenwald and Leavitt (1984), for example, speculated that advertising is more likely to be effective when issue involvement is high because advertising will be better attended and advertising-generated brand attitudes will be more efficiently encoded in memory. However, it is possible that the opposite is true. When consumers are optimizing, they are likely to engage in an extensive search for relevant information at the brand response occasion. As a result, advertising must compete with other (likely) more accessible and (potentially) more relevant information. When consumers are indifferent, they are less likely to engage in any search at the brand response occasion. Assuming advertising can efficiently encode affective information that is automatically retrieved at the brand response occasion, it may have a greater opportunity to mediate choice when brand response involvement is low.

Relatedly, the RAM postulates that the primary reason for breakdowns in advertising effectiveness shifts from accessibility to relevance as brand response

involvement increases. When consumers are indifferent, the RAM presumes consumers will choose any available brand. Choice behavior can be directly affected by approach tendencies created by automatically retrieved affect, but there is neither deliberate search for information nor evaluation of accessed information; accessibility is key. When consumers are satisficing, the RAM predicts that consumers will take the first acceptable brand. In this case there is limited evaluation of the relevance of accessed quality cues; cues must be reassuring, but not necessarily superior to other cues. Since the first acceptable quality cue mediates choice, then accessibility must be of paramount concern to advertisers. When consumers are optimizing, consumers will seek the best brand. Since consumers will expend significant effort to seek and evaluate information, relative relevance becomes the priority. This issue of relative salience (i.e., order of retrieval) versus relevance is important and needs to be studied further.

There are many unanswered questions regarding both advertising message involvement and brand response involvement. The dissertation identifies antecedents of both constructs. Issue involvement (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981), need for information (Burnkrant & Sawyer, 1983), message content relevance (Toy, 1982; Brock & Albert, 1978), message content novelty (Taylor & Fiske, 1978) and arousal-evoking ability (Silk & Vavra, 1974; Mandler, 1984) were all identified as antecedents of advertising message involvement. Dimensions of decision-making risk were identified as the primary antecedents of brand response involvement (Bloch & Richins, 1983; Bauer, 1867; Robertson, 1976). Much more work is needed to identify and model the antecedents of both constructs. Once more is known about the antecedents of involvement, it will be possible to better anticipate those situations when advertising is less likely to be effective because, for example, AMI is lower than BRI. It may also be possible to manipulate AMI antecedents to increase the likelihood that AMI and BRI will correspond, and

thus increase advertising effectiveness, both in the laboratory and in the real world. For example, advertisers may be able to increase AMI, or even BRI, by relying on a means-ends analysis and using the results of insights provided through techniques such as laddering (Reynolds & Guttman, 1984). Should advertisers learn how consumers are currently making decisions in a product category and then communicate at that level as the RAM implies; or are attempts to increase BRI a viable marketing strategy?

The indifferent, satisficing and optimizing categories need to be explored more completely. Indifferent choice behavior is characterized in this dissertation as undeliberate. Approach tendencies created by automatically accessed affect were theorized as the major precursor to behavior. It is possible, however, that other forms of information and more complex processes could fall into the indifferent route if they too could be found to be undeliberate. What other decision rules have the potential to become products of automatic processing? Another key issue is the relative efficacy of the exposure effect (Zajonc, 1965; Obermiller, 1985) and affective classical conditioning (McSweeney & Bierley, 1986). Which process more efficiently and durably links affect to brands? Which process can more effectively mediate behavior?

More research is needed on satisficing. For example, are there categories of quality cues that are more likely to be effective than others? In an increasingly segmented marketplace, lifestyle identification (e.g., "this brand is for people like me") and situational association (e.g., "weekends are made for Michelob") deserve attention. Is satisficing the most common of the three brand response routes identified in the model?

How does price factor into the RAM's theoretical structure? Price may be considered a choice cue, an indicator of relative quality or a more deep-seated philosophy of buying whose effects reside outside the boundaries of the RAM

framework. For example, a consumer may believe there is no risk attached to brand choice in a category, but rather than exhibit indifferent behavior, he/she may buy whatever brand is the least expensive. This type of behavior does not cleanly fit into any of the RAM's three brand response categories. Similarly, variety seeking may fall outside the boundary conditions of the framework.

APPENDIX A
MESSAGE APPEAL COPY

Indifferent Appeal

(The Beach Boy hit, 409, is in the background throughout the ad)

Does your car have get up and go? Does your car deserve the best? Hey, motor oils can make a difference. So do your car a fave and remember the name _____, _____ Motor Oil. Max it our with _____, _____ Motor Oil.

Satisficing Appeal

"This is A. J. Foyt. Behind me are the sounds of the Daytona 500 -- one of racing's true 'torture tests'. Survival comes first. Winning? Well, that's an added bonus. I'll take every edge I can get out there. An edge I've learned to depend on is _____ Motor Oil. _____'s special additives drastically reduce engine wear and tear. On the raceway that means engine survival. Off the track, _____ works in my family car to give me a smoother ride, improve fuel economy and a long engine life. Put _____ to the test in your car".

Optimizing Appeal

For the good of your car, some popular myths must be destroyed forever. All motor oils lubricate engine parts. Some motor oils have special additives that do more, but only _____ is blended with synthetic anti-wear and anti-corrosion additives that protect your car better and longer. The test results are out. After four years of extensive road testing by Road and Track magazine on GM, Nissan and Porsche, the evidence speaks for itself. _____ increased fuel economy 15% better than the second best motor oil _____ extended engine life 22% longer than the second best motor oil. Synthetic additives do it, four years of road testing proves it. Destroy myths and buy _____.

APPENDIX B
EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[Day 1: High Involvement]

General Instructions

On the next page you will read a description of the radio program you are about to hear. You will also ready instructions as to how you should listen to this program and its accompanying advertisements. It is very important that you read these instructions carefully. If you do not allocate your attention in the manner in which you are instructed, it is very unlikely that you will be able to do well on the memory test that follows the program. There is a monetary reward if you perform well on this test.

Lone Ranger Instructions

Carefully read through these instructions twice.

In a few moments you will listen to segments of an old time radio show: "The Lone Ranger". There is a renewed interest in this and other old time radio shows, particularly among young people, in many parts of the north. As a result, it is being considered for use by a local rock radio station. The producers and advertising sponsors of these programs are interested in estimating their appeal to several audience types in the Gainesville area. That's why you are here.

As you listen, you will notice an unusually high number of advertisements in two product categories: clothing stores (you will hear advertisements for Maas Brothers, Annie Hall, and Dollar General) and motor oils (you will hear advertisements for Purity, Austin, and Easyride). Beyond assessing the appeal of the Lone Ranger, potential sponsors are trying to assess student receptivity to advertising in these categories.

We would like you to listen to the Lone Ranger as you would normally listen to any radio show with which you are interested. We would like you to pay considerably more than normal attention to the advertising accompanying the Lone Ranger. You should listen to the Lone Ranger to remember the basic plots of the show segments. You should listen to all the advertisements to remember their themes and their specific details.

Immediately after the program, you will be given a memory test requiring you to recognize simple summaries of the Lone Ranger episodes, but recall specific details about the brand advertisements (a much more difficult task). There will be 5 true-false questions about the Lone Ranger and 5 fill in the blank questions about the advertisements. Any person who answers 90% of the questions correctly will earn $5.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded. Below are some examples of the questions you may be asked:

1. The name of the Lone Ranger's horse is Silver. T F

2. The Lone Ranger and Tonto met when they were children. T F

3. List two of the advertised items in the "Mass Brothers" advertisement. _____

4. Which store is known for "Everyday Low Prices"? _____

Since your reactions to the program can distract or influence the reactions of others around you, please do not talk during the broadcast. The entire broadcast should last about forty minutes.

Memory Test

Below are ten questions about the Lone Ranger and some of the advertised brands. As outlined above, any person who answers 90% of these questions correctly will earn $5.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded.

1. Five Texas Rangers were killed in the Cavendish Raid. T F

2. The Lone Ranger's younger brother was among those killed in the Raid. T F

3. The Lone Ranger was unconscious for 3 days after the Cavendish Raid. T F

4. Silver was fighting a giant bull when the Lone Ranger saved him. T F

5. In the third episode, Apache warriors wiped out the wagon train. T F

6. The week long sale at Maas Brothers is called "_____".

7. Dollar General is selling full figure ladies jeans for $_____.

8. Which store is giving away grooming sets with any $25.00 purchase of Perry Ellis products? _____

9. Of the many items advertised, ladies' gowns are on sale for $_____ at Dollar General Stores.

10. According to the Annie Hall commercial, "It is said in France _____".

This is the end of the first session of the experiment. When you return tomorrow, you will be asked to rate The Lone Ranger on several criteria. Remember, you must be present at the second session in order to receive credit for the experiment and any monetary compensation that you earned today. See you tomorrow!

[Day 1: Moderate Involvement]

General Instructions

On the next page you will read a description of the radio program you are about to hear. You will also ready instructions as to how you should listen to this program and its accompanying advertisements. It is very important that you read these instructions carefully. If you do not allocate your attention in the manner in which you are instructed, it is very unlikely that you will be able to do well on the memory test that follows the program. There is a monetary reward if you perform well on this test.

Lone Ranger Instructions

Carefully read through these instructions twice.

In a few moments you will listen to segments of an old time radio show: "The Lone Ranger". There is a renewed interest in this and other old time radio shows, particularly among young people, in many parts of the north. As a result, it is being considered for use by a local rock radio station. The producers and advertising sponsors of these programs are interested in estimating their appeal to several audience types in the Gainesville area. That's why you are here.

As you listen, you will notice an unusually high number of advertisements in two product categories: clothing stores (you will hear advertisements for Maas Brothers, Annie Hall, and Dollar General) and motor oils (you will hear advertisements for Purity, Austin, and Easyride). Beyond assessing the appeal of the Lone Ranger, potential sponsors are trying to assess student receptivity to advertising in these categories.

We would like you to listen to the advertising accompanying the program as you normally listen to radio advertising in product categories where you make frequent purchases. You should be able to associate each brand name with its general advertising theme. We would like you to listen to the Lone Ranger considerably more intently than you normally listen to any radio show. You should be able to remember specific details of the Lone Ranger episodes.

Immediately after the program, you will be given a memory test requiring you to simply recognize the advertising themes of advertised brands, but to recall specific details about the Lone Ranger episodes. (This is a much more difficult task than remembering advertising themes; therefore, most of your attention should be put here.) There will be 7 fill in the blank questions about the Lone Ranger and 3 true-false questions about the advertising. Any person who answers 80% of the questions correctly will earn $1.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded. Below are some examples of the questions you may be asked:

1. The advertisements for "Maas Brothers" had a rock music background. T F

2. Dollar General Stores were advertising a sale. T F

3. How many graves did Tonto dig after the Cavendish Raid? _____

4. In the second episode, who shot the Lone Ranger's horse? _____

Since your reactions to the program can distract or influence the reactions of others around you, please do not talk during the broadcast. The entire broadcast should last about forty minutes.

Memory Test

Below are ten questions about the Lone Ranger and some of the advertised brands. As outlined above, any person who answers 80% of these questions correctly will earn $1.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded.

1. What was the name of the scout traitor in the first episode? _____

2. Captain Reed of the Texas Rangers wanted his brother to quit the Rangers to do what? _____

3. Exactly how did the Lone Ranger and Tonto meet?
_____

4. What was Silver fighting when the Lone Ranger saved him?
_____

5. Why did the Lone Ranger want to let Silver go? _____

6. What did Silver like about the Lone Ranger? _____

7. In what part of the country did the third episode take place? _____

8. In the Dollar General Store, ladies jeans were on sales for $10.95. T F

9. The Maas Brother's celebration was called "Isle of Sunshine". T F

10. Annie Hall advertised French lingerie. T F

This is the end of the first session of the experiment. When you return tomorrow, you will be asked to rate The Lone Ranger on several criteria. Remember, you must be present at the second session in order to receive credit for the experiment and any monetary compensation that you earned today. See you tomorrow.

[Day 1: Low Involvement]

General Instructions

On the next page you will read a description of the radio program you are about to hear. You will also ready instructions as to how you should listen to this program and its accompanying advertisements. It is very important that you read these instructions carefully. If you do not allocate your attention in the manner in which you are instructed, it is very unlikely that you will be able to do well on the memory test that follows the program. There is a monetary reward if you perform well on this test.

Lone Ranger Instructions

Carefully read through these instructions twice.

In a few moments you will listen to segments of an old time radio show: "The Lone Ranger". There is a renewed interest in this and other old time radio shows, particularly among young people, in many parts of the north. As a result, it is being considered for use by a local rock radio station. The producers and advertising sponsors of these programs are interested in estimating their appeal to several audience types in the Gainesville area. That's why you are here.

As you listen, you will notice an unusually high number of advertisements in two product categories: clothing stores (you will hear advertisements for Maas Brothers, Annie Hall, and Dollar General) and motor oils (you will hear advertisements for Purity, Austin, and Easyride). Beyond assessing the appeal of the Lone Ranger, potential sponsors are trying to assess student receptivity to advertising in these categories.

We would like you to listen to the Lone Ranger considerably more carefully than you would normally listen to any radio show with which you are interested. Other individuals are being asked to listen to the advertising accompanying the show, so you may disregard any advertising.

Immediately after the program, you will be given a memory test requiring you to recall specific details about the Lone Ranger episodes. There will be ten fill in the blank questions about the Lone Ranger. Any person who answers 90% of the questions correctly will earn $5.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded. Below are some examples of the questions you may ask:

1. What was the full name of the Lone Ranger's nephew? _____

2. In the second episode, who shot the Lone Ranger's horse? _____

3. After the ambush, how many days was the Lone Ranger unconscious? _____

Since your reactions to the program can distract or influence the reactions of others around you, please do not talk during the broadcast. The entire broadcast should last about forty minutes.

Memory Test

Below are ten questions about the Lone Ranger. As outlined above, any person who answers 90% of these questions correctly will earn $5.00. Lower scores will not be rewarded.

1. How many graves did Tonto dig after the Cavendish Raid? _____

2. Captain Reed of the Texas Rangers wanted his brother to quit the Rangers to do what? _____

3. Exactly how did the Lone Ranger and Tonto meet?
_____

4. What was Silver fighting when the Lone Ranger saved him?
_____

5. Why did the Lone Ranger want to let Silver go? _____

6. What did Silver like about the Lone Ranger?
_____

7. In what part of the country did the third episode take place?
_____

8. In the third episode, how many years went by before the Lone Ranger found his lost nephew? _____

9. Where did the Lone Ranger go to report the wagon train slaughter in the third episode? _____

10. What was the name of the scout traitor in the first episode? _____

This is the end of the first session of the experiment. When you return tomorrow, you will be asked to rate the Lone Ranger on several criteria. Remember, you must be present at the second session in order to receive credit for the experiment and any monetary compensation that you earned today. (See you tomorrow!)

[Day 2: High Involvement]

Lone Ranger Evaluation

1. The Lone Ranger was:
   a. Easy to Understand
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   b. Entertaining
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   c. Interesting
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   d. Funny
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   e. Antiquated
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   f. Ridiculous
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

2. On the scales presented below, please rate how you feel about the Lone Ranger:
   Good ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Bad
   Foolish ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Wise
   Favorable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unfavorable
   Harmful ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Beneficial

3. Listening to the Lone Ranger put me in a pleasant mood.
   Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

4. Listening to the Lone Ranger put me in a bad mood.
   Strongly Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree

5. I would rather listen to the Lone Ranger and shows like it than listen to:
   a. Rock Music
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   b. News Shows
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   c. Religious Programming
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

Advertising Related Questions

You are about to be asked a question about three of the product classes that were advertised during the programming you heard in the first experimental session. If you give the correct answer to each question you will win $5.00. One incorrect answer and you win nothing.

In a few moments, the experimenter will instruct you to turn the page. Read the question. Think carefully before you answer the question. You will have 1 minute to think before the experimenter asks you to circle one of the brands.

STOP! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL SO INSTRUCTED

Question #1

1. Assuming that you want to buy the highest quality motor oil available, and you must choose from the three brands below, which brand would you choose? Think carefully. The experimenter will ask you to circle one of the brands in 1 minute.

   a. Purity
   b. Austin
   c. Easyride

In a few moments, the experimenter will instruct you to turn the page. On the next page there will be two more questions. You must answer these questions correctly to earn the $5.00. You will have 1 minute to answer these questions. At the end of this time period, you must return the questionnaire to the experimenter.

STOP! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL SO INSTRUCTED

Two More Questions

You have 1 minute to respond to these questions.

1. List the name and price of two of the items that were advertised for sale at the Dollar General Stores.

   a. _____
   b. _____

2. What was the name of the Maas Brother sale? _____

[Day 2: Moderate Involvement]

Lone Ranger Evaluation

1. The Lone Ranger was:
   a. Easy to Understand
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   b. Entertaining
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   c. Interesting
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   d. Funny
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   e. Antiquated
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   f. Ridiculous
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

2. On the scales presented below, please rate how you feel about the Lone Ranger:
   Good ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Bad
   Foolish ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Wise
   Favorable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unfavorable
   Harmful ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Beneficial

3. Listening to the Lone Ranger put me in a pleasant mood.
   Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

4. Listening to the Lone Ranger put me in a bad mood.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree

5. I would rather listen to the Lone Ranger and shows like it than listen to:
   a. Rock Music
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   b. News Shows
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   c. Religious Programming
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE

Advertising Related Questions

On the next page there are 3 questions. There are three possible answers to each question. Two of the three possible answers to each question are satisfactory. One is unsatisfactory. If you give a satisfactory response to each question you will win $1.00.

You must respond to all three questions within 1 minute. At the end of the minute, the experimenter will instruct you to flip the page and turn in the questionnaire.

STOP! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED

Advertising Related Questions

1. Two of the three advertised clothing stores carry the highest quality items. Choose one of these two stores. _____

2. Two of the advertised motor oils are likely to be of high quality. Choose one of these brands of motor oil.
   a. Purity
   b. Austin
   c. Easyride

3. Two of the advertised clothing stores advertised a sale. List one of these two stores. _____

[Day 3: Low Involvement]

Lone Ranger Evaluation

1. The Lone Ranger was:
   a. Easy to Understand
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   b. Entertaining
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   c. Interesting
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   d. Funny
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   e. Antiquated
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   f. Ridiculous
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

2. On the scales presented below, please rate how you feel about the Lone Ranger:
   Good ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Bad
   Foolish ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Wise
   Favorable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Unfavorable
   Harmful ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Beneficial

3. Listening to the Lone Ranger put me in a pleasant mood.
   Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

4. Listening to the Lone Ranger put me in a bad mood.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree

5. I would rather listen to the Lone Ranger and shows like it than listen to:
   a. Rock Music
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   b. News Shows
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree
   c. Religious Programming
      Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE

Advertising Related Questions

Part 1. In the space provided below, please list three product classes (e.g., automobiles) that you believe to be heavily advertised on the radio. List the first three product types that come to mind. This should take no longer than one minute.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

On the next page, you'll find a list of brands in twelve heavily advertised product classes. When the experimenter instructs you, turn the page and simply choose a brand that you like from each product class.

Choose quickly. You have one minute to choose a brand from each product category. At the end of the minute, you will be asked to stop and to turn in the questionnaire.

STOP! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED

The Product Classes

1. Choose a clothing store you like:
   a. Maas Brothers
   b. Dollar General
   c. Annie Hall

2. Choose a cereal you like:
   a. Wheaties
   b. Total
   c. Special K

3. Choose a pizza restaurant you like:
   a. Leonardos
   b. Pizza Hut
   c. Pizza Pronto

4. Choose a soap you like:
   a. Ivory
   b. Irish Spring
   c. Dove

5. Choose a gasoline you like:
   a. Chevron
   b. Amoco
   c. Shell

6. Choose a Breakfast House:
   a. Granny's
   b. Skeeter's
   c. Waffle House

7. Choose a motor oil you like:
   a. Easyride
   b. Austin
   c. Purity

8. Choose a deodorant:
   a. Right Guard
   b. Sure
   c. Mitchum

9. Choose a detergent you like:
   a. Tide
   b. Cheer
   c. All

10. Choose a toothpaste:
    a. Colgate
    b. Aim
    c. Crest

11. Choose a beer you like:
    a. Budweiser
    b. Coors
    c. Busch

12. Choose a candy bar:
    a. Snickers
    b. Milky Way
    c. M & M's

[Day 2: General Questionnaire]

General Questionnaire Instructions

Please read all the questions carefully before you respond. If you have any questions, please ask the experimenter. That's why he's here. Don't concern yourself with how you think the experimenter or anyone else might want you to answer these questions. There are no right or wrong answers. What is important is that you answer all questions as honestly and as completely as possible.

You are required to work on the next session for a minimum of twenty-five minutes. Nobody will be excused for 25 minutes.

Experimental Perceptions

1. As I listened to the show yesterday, I didn't think about any "hidden purpose" to the study. I simply followed instructions.
   Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

2. As I listened to the programming yesterday, I thought the experiment was more concerned with my reactions to the advertising than the experimental instructions stated.
   Strongly Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Agree

3. I entered the experiment today thinking that the motor oil advertisements were more important than the advertisements for the clothing stores.
   Strongly Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Strongly Disagree

4. Besides studying the potential appeal of the Lone Ranger and other old time radio shows, we are very interested in learning about your perceptions of the advertisements you heard yesterday. In fact, the major focus of the experiment is actually concerned with your reactions to the advertising. Some students are being asked about the clothing store advertisements. You will be asked a series of questions about the motor oil advertisements. Please indicate when, if ever, you thought the experiment was predominantly concerned with the motor oil advertisements.
   a. Yesterday
   b. Today when I made my motor oil choice
   c. Just now

Motor Oil Follow-Up Questions

1. Recall the brand of motor oil you just selected. Why did you choose that brand?

   _____

   _____

2. How confident are you in the choice of motor oil you just made?
   Totally Confident ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Not at all Confident

3. We would like to learn how strongly you prefer the brand of motor oil you just selected. You have ten points you may distribute among the three brands. Assign more points to the brand(s) you are most likely to purchase and fewer points to the brand(s) you are less likely to purchase. Remember, the sum of the points must add up to ten. Fractions of points (i.e., 2.5 points) may not be allocated to brands.

   Purity, ___ # of points_____
   Austin, ___ # of points_____
   Easyride, _ # of points_____

PLEASE PROCEED TO THE NEXT PAGE

Attention to the Advertising Presentation

READ THE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE YOU RESPOND TO THE SCALES!!

A. Think back to the set of motor oil advertisements that you listened to yesterday. Using the scales below, describe your level of attention to the motor oil advertisements. That is, characterize the quality of your attention to these advertisements.

1. Very Low ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Very High
   Normal
2. Very Motivated ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Very Unmotivated
   Moderately Motivated
3. Very Intense ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Not at all Intense
   Moderately Intense
4. Didn't Matter ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Mattered A Lot
   Mattered Moderately

B. Below are some statements that describe the approach you may have taken to listen to the motor oil advertisements. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. I tried to memorize the content of the motor oil advertisements.
   Strongly Disagree ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Strongly Agree
   Somewhat

2. I explicitly compared the content of the three motor oil advertisements as I listened to them.
   Strongly Agree ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Strongly Disagree
   Somewhat

3. Basically, I disregarded the advertisements.
   Strongly Disagree ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Strongly Agree
   Somewhat

4. I decided which one of the motor oils I thought was the best while I was listening to the advertisements.
   Strongly Disagree ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Strongly Disagree
   Somewhat

5. I didn't decide which motor oil I liked the most until today when I was asked to choose one of them.
   Strongly Disagree ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Strongly Agree
   Somewhat

PLEASE PROCEED TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Choice-Related Effort

READ THE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE YOU RESPOND TO THE SCALES!!

A. Think back to the motor oil choice you just made. Use the scales below to describe the amount of thought you were able to put into to your motor oil choice. That is characterize the effort you expended to make the motor oil. Consider only the effort that characterized your motor oil choice, not the effort you may have spent on the other questions that accompanied the motor oil question.

1. Very Motivated ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Very Unmotivated
   Moderately Motivated
2. Didn't Matter ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Mattered A Lot
   Mattered Moderately
3. Of Strong Concern ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Of No Concern
   Of Moderate Concern
4. Meant Nothing ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Meant A Lot
   Moderate Meaning

B. Below are some statements that describe the manner in which you made your motor oil brand choice. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. I tried very hard to recall all the advertising information I could about each brand of motor oil before I made my choice.
   Strongly Agree ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Strongly Disagree

2. I tried very hard to compare all the plusses and minuses of each advertised brand before I made my choice.
   Strongly Disagree ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Strongly Agree

3. Check the statement that best characterizes the manner in which you made your brand choice.
   a. I didn't think much about my choice; instead, I chose the brand with which I felt most comfortable. _____
   b. I made a serious effort to choose the best of the three brands. _____
   c. I tried to choose a good brand, not necessarily the best brand. _____

PROCEED TO THE NEXT PAGE

General Recall Instructions

You are about to list everything you can remember about the motor oil advertisements and your personal reactions to these ads. It is very important that you expend considerable time and effort to try and remember the content of the advertising. Do not give up if you don't remember anything right away. We have learned from experience that people can remember a lot more than they think they can if they try hard enough.

As you perform this task, you may remember aspects of the advertising that you did not remember when you made your original choice. So, after you complete both parts of this section, you will be asked if you want to change your choice of motor oil. Carefully read the instructions to both part 1 and part 2 below before you begin writing.

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE.

PART 1: MOTOR OIL AD RECALL.

Please recall as many details as you can about each of the ads. First, describe the ad's theme. Then, list the ad's content. Be as specific as possible. Discuss one ad at a time. Do not evaluate the content here; just write down what you remember about the advertising content. You should spend at leas 3 minutes on each brand.

PURITY.
General Theme:

Specific Details:

AUSTIN.
General Theme:

Specific Details:

EASYRIDE.
General Theme:

Specific Details:

TURN THE PAGE FOR PART 2

PART 2: MOTOR OIL AD EVALUATION.

Please discuss your personal reactions to the advertisements and the advertised brands. You should spend at least two minutes on each brand. Think carefully. If you recall more content details of any of the ads when you are answering this section, please turn back to Part 1 and write down the information there.

Were any of the ads more credible or believable than the other ads? Which one? Why?

Did any of the ads make you believe that its motor oil provided increased fuel economy or extended engine life better than the other brands? Which one? Why?

Without considering specific message information, did any of the ads make you feel better than the other ads? Which one? Why?

Now that you've had considerably more time to think about the motor oils than you had when you made your choice, would you like to change your motor oil choice? Yes____ No____

If so, which brand would you now like to choose?

a. Austin
b. Purity
c. Easyride

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE

How many times do you think that each of the motor oil ads was repeated?

a. Austin _____
b. Purity _____
c. Easyride _____

To what extent do you work on your own car?

a. Never
b. Rarely
c. Minor repairs
d. Minor and major work

Which of the following statements is most accurate?

a. I never change my own oil.
b. I typically change the oil at gas stations.
c. I typically buy motor oil at the store and change my oil at home.

If you have any comments you would like to make about the experiment, please make them below. We would be particularly interested with what you think the specific purpose of the experiment might be and the motor oil you think the experimenter wanted you to pick.

If you have extra time, please go back and work some more on the motor oil advertisement recall and evaluation section!!

Note About Monetary Compensation. The experimenter is making a list of all the people who have earned monetary awards. This list will be put on the sign-up board. The money will be available at the conclusion of the experiment (about three or four weeks). A note will be put up on the sign-up board at that time telling you how to pick up the money.

Finally, please do not discuss this experiment with individuals in the class that have yet to participate in it. If subjects know what to expect, it will influence their reactions to the experiment and destroy the validity of the experiment. Thank you for your consideration.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!!

APPENDIX C
PRETEST INSTRUCTIONS

[Session 1]

General Instructions

The purpose of this experimental session is to gather information that will be used to produce an advertising campaign for a new brand of motor oil. There are four parts to this experiment. The first part will help us to choose an appropriate brand name for the new motor oil. The second part will help us to choose a spokesperson for the brand. The third part will help us with our advertising message copy. The fourth part will help us to choose background music for the campaign.

Please follow instructions as closely as possible. If you have any questions or problems, talk to the experimenter. That's why he's here. You may now turn the page and begin work on Part One of the experiment.

Part One

Below is a list of brand names. Fifteen are brand names of motor oil, ten are not. Please look at each brand name and rate the degree to which you recognize it as a brand of motor oil. If you assign a brand a '+3' rating, you are indicating that you definitely recognize it as being a motor oil. A '+2' rating indicates that you are confident, but not absolutely certain it's a motor oil. A '+1' indicates that you think you recognize it as being a motor oil, but you aren't sure. a '-3', on the other hand, indicates that you definitely do not think it's a brand of motor oil. A '-2' rating indicates that you are confident, but absolutely certain it's not a motor oil. A '-1' indicates that you don't think it's a motor oil, but it could be. A '0' indicates that you are not sure one way or the other.

	Motor Oil	+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	Not Motor Oil
Brand Names									
1.	Havoline	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
2.	Sunpower	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
3.	Valvoline	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
4.	Multipower	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
5.	Ridall	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
6.	Arco Graphite	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
7.	Fire & Ice	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
8.	All-Season	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
9.	Southwestern	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
10.	Mobil 1	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
11.	Ram	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
12.	Supraline	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
13.	Gulfpride	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
14.	Austin	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
15.	Pennzoil	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
16.	Dixon	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
17.	Castrol	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
18.	Quaker State	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
19.	Ultra D	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
20.	Purity	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
21.	Easyride	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
22.	Guardline	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
23.	Kendall	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
24.	Dutch Blend	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
25.	Torque	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	

PROCEED TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Part Two

In the space provided below, please list the names of five famous race car drivers. If you cannot think of five, list as many as you can.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

STOP!! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED.

Below is a list of people. Some of these people are race car drivers, others are not. Please look at each name and rate the degree to which you believe the person is a race car driver. The scale is identical to the one you just completed. If you rate a person as a '+3', you are certain he is a racer. A '-3' indicates that you are certain he is not a racer. A rating of '0' indicates that you aren't sure one way or the other.

Racer	+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	Not a Racer
Names								
1. Gary Fencik	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
2. Bobby Unser	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
3. Walter Payton	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
4. Richard Petty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
5. Bobby Rahal	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
6. Bob Seagram	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
7. A. J. Foyt	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
8. Mario Andretti	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
9. Bobby Allison	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
10. Bill Elliott	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
11. Pat Cash	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
12. Al Unser	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
13. Dan Gurney	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
14. Tommy Herr	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
15. Parnelli Jones	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	

PROCEED TO PART THREE

Part Three

Why do you buy motor oil? Motor oils can provide several benefits for automobiles. Some do a better job than others in providing these benefits. Some provide more benefits than others. In the space provided below, please list all the functions that motor oils can perform. Be as specific as possible.

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

4. _____

_____

5. _____

_____

Now, go back to the benefits you listed. How important is each benefit to you? Rank each of the benefits in terms of their importance beginning with '1' as the most important. Put the number in parentheses next to the listed benefit.

PROCEED TO THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR PART FOUR.

Part Four

You are about to hear portions of several popular songs with themes about cars and driving. Each of these songs is being considered for use in an advertisement for motor oils. Please help us pick the best song for the advertisement. Think of the following as you listen to each song. First, note how the songs make you feel. The ideal song should excite and energize you in a very positive way. Second, think about how appropriate each song is as a musical background to a motor oil ad that is trying to appeal to people like yourself.

STOP!! PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED.

Think about the feelings that each of these songs inspired. We would like to find out which of these songs created the best, most exhilarating feeling. Below you will be asked to compare the feelings generated by the songs, two songs at a time.

Example. Suppose that you were asked to compare Lionel Richie's "Say You Say Me" with Madonna's "Like a Virgin." If "Say You Say Me" creates a far more exhilarating feeling for you than "Like a Virgin", then you should check the '+3' at the extreme left of the scale. If you think it's better, but not by a huge margin, then '+2' would be most appropriate. Conversely, if "Like a Virgin" evokes a much more intensely positive reaction than "Say You Say Me", then you should check the '+3' at the extreme right of the scale. If both songs generate equal feelings, then you should check the '0'.

Say You Say Me Superior			About the Same			Like a Virgin Superior
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

Rate each pair of songs in terms of their relative ability to generate a positive, exhilarating feeling:

1. "Radar Love" vs. "Panama".

Radar Love Superior			About the Same			Panama Superior
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. "Panama" vs. "Pink Cadillac".

Panama Superior			About the Same			Pink Cadillac Superior
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "409".

Pink Cadillac Superior			About the Same			409 Superior
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

4. "Red Corvette" vs. "Panama".

Red Corvette Superior			About the Same			Panama Superior
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE.

5. "409" vs. "Panama".

409 Superior			About the Same		Panama Superior	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

6. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "Red Corvette".

Pink Cadillac Superior			About the Same		Red Corvette Superior	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

7. "Red Corvette" vs. "Radar Love".

Red Corvette Superior			About the Same		Radar Love Superior	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

8. "409" vs. "Red Corvette".

409 Superior			About the Same		Red Corvette Superior	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

9. "Radar Love" vs. "Pink Cadillac".

Radar Love Superior			About the Same		Pink Cadillac	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

10. "Radar Love" vs. "409".

Radar Love Superior			About the Same		409 Superior	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

STOP!! DO NOT PROCEED UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED.

Now you are going to rate the songs again. This time think about their relative appropriateness as background music for a motor oil advertisement designed to appeal to people like yourself.

Example. Suppose again that you were asked to compare Lionel Richie's "Say You Say Me" with Madonna's "Like a Virgin" for appropriateness as background music for a new perfume/cologne. If you believe that "Say You Say Me" has some quality about it that makes it far more appropriate (perhaps because it's romantic) than "Like a Virgin" then you should check the '+3' at the extreme left of the scale. If you think it is more appropriate, but not by an extreme margin, then a '+2' or '+1' would be the best response. On the other hand, if "Like a Virgin" has a style, evokes a feeling, or creates an image that you think is far more appropriate (perhaps because it's sexy and arousing) than "Say You Say Me", then you should check the '+3' at the extreme right of the scale. If both songs are equally appropriate (or equally inappropriate) then the '0' in the middle of the scale is the best response.

Say You Say Me Appropriate About the Same Like a Virgin Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

Please rate the relative appropriateness of each song pair as background music for a motor oil advertisement designed to appeal to people like yourself.

1. "Radar Love" vs. "Panama".

Radar Love Appropriate About the Same Panama Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. "Panama" vs. "Pink Cadillac".

Panama Appropriate About the Same Pink Cadillac Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "409".

Pink Cadillac Appropriate About the Same 409 Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

4. "Red Corvette" vs. "Panama".

Red Corvette Appropriate About the Same Panama Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE.

5. "409" vs. "Panama".

409 Appropriate About the Same Panama Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

6. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "Red Corvette".

Pink Cadillac Appropriate About the Same Red Corvette Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

7. "Red Corvette" vs. "Radar Love".

Red Corvette Appropriate About the Same Radar Love Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

8. "409" vs. "Red Corvette".

409 Appropriate About the Same Red Corvette Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

9. "Radar Love" vs. "Pink Cadillac".

Radar Love Appropriate About the Same Pink Cadillac Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

10. "Radar Love" vs. "409".

Radar Love Appropriate About the Same 409 Appropriate

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

PLEASE TURN IN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE TO YOUR EXPERIMENTER.
THANK YOU FOR YOU PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!!

[Session 2]

General Instructions

The tasks you are about to perform will help us to choose a brand name for a new product. There are three parts to this session. Each involves the same list of potential names for the product. First, you will be asked to rate the familiarity of the names to you. Second, you will be asked to rate how much you like the sound and look of the names. Third, you will be asked to rate the quality perception that the names inspire.

Each of the three parts will use a similar rating procedure. Brand name candidates will be compared two at a time in terms of their relative familiarity, liking, and quality perceptions. Below is an example of how to use the scale.

Suppose that you were asked to rate who you think was the better president, John F. Kennedy or Richard M. Nixon. If you think that Kennedy was far superior to Nixon, then a rating of '+3' at the far left is the best response. If you think that Kennedy was definitely better (but not by a huge margin), then a '+2' would be most appropriate. A response of '+1' is appropriate if you think Kennedy was only slightly better than Nixon. If on the other hand you believe that Nixon was a vastly superior president, then you should check the '+3' at the extreme right of the scale. If you think that both presidents were equally good (or equally bad), then a '0' in the middle of the scale is the suitable response.

Kennedy Superior			About the Same		Nixon Superior	
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

If you have any questions about the use of the scale or any of the instructions during this session, please ask the experimenter. He is here to help you. If you don't have any questions at this point, please proceed to Part One on the following page.

Part One

Please rate each pair of names in terms of their familiarity. That is, your rating for each name pair should reflect the degree to which you've seen or heard one name more than the other. The more familiar name should read and sound more comfortable, more friendly. The brand names you will be rating are Purity, Austin, Supraline, Dutch Blend, Easyride, and Guardline.

1. Easyride vs. Austin.

Easyride More Familiar			About the Same	Austin More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. Supraline vs. Purity.

Supraline More Familiar			About the Same	Purity More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. Purity vs. Guardline.

Purity More Familiar			About the Same	Guardline More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

4. Guardline vs. Easyride.

Guardline More Familiar			About the Same	Easyride More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

5. Dutch Blend vs. Supraline.

Dutch Blend More Familiar			About the Same	Supraline More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

6. Austin vs. Purity.

Austin More Familiar			About the Same	Purity More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

7. Easyride vs. Supraline.

Easyride More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

8. Purity vs. Dutch Blend.

Purity More Familiar About the Same Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

9. Supraline vs. Guardline.

Supraline More Familiar About the Same Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

10. Dutch Blend vs. Easyride.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

11. Austin vs. Supraline.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

12. Guardline vs. Dutch Blend.

Guardline More Familiar About the Same Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

13. Dutch Blend vs. Austin.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Austin More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

14. Austin vs. Guardline.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

15. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity More Familiar			About the Same	Easyride More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

PLEASE PROCEED TO PART TWO.

Part Two

Think about how the names look and sound. Are they pleasant or unpleasant? Which name in each pair is more pleasant, more likeable? Your rating for each brand name pair should reflect the degree to which one brand engenders a more pleasant reaction than the other.

1. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity More Familiar | About the Same | Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3
____	____	____	____	____	____	____

2. Austin vs. Guardline.

Austin More Familiar | About the Same | Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3
____	____	____	____	____	____	____

3. Dutch Blend vs. Austin.

Dutch Blend More Familiar | About the Same | Austin More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3
____	____	____	____	____	____	____

4. Guardline vs. Dutch Blend.

Guardline More Familiar | About the Same | Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3
____	____	____	____	____	____	____

5. Austin vs. Supraline.

Austin More Familiar | About the Same | Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3
____	____	____	____	____	____	____

6. Dutch Blend vs. Easyride.

Dutch Blend More Familiar | About the Same | Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3
____	____	____	____	____	____	____

7. Supraline vs. Guardline.

Supraline More Familiar About the Same Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

8. Purity vs. Dutch Blend.

Purity More Familiar About the Same Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

9. Easyride vs. Supraline.

Easyride More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

10. Austin vs. Purity.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Purity More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

11. Dutch Blend vs. Supraline.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

12. Guardline vs. Easyride.

Guardline More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

13. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

14. Supraline vs. Purity.

Supraline More Familiar About the Same Purity More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

15. Easyride vs. Austin.

Easyride More Familiar			About the Same	Austin More Familiar		
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

STOP!! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED.

Part Three

The brand name candidates you have been rating are for a new brand of motor oil. Brand names often create perceptions of quality (or lack of quality) which can influence brand choice. Think about each of the brand names below and the impressions of quality they communicate. Compare each brand pair on the basis of the relative perception of quality (or the lack thereof) that they create.

1. Easyride vs. Austin.

Easyride Higher Quality			About the Same	Austin Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

2. Supraline vs. Purity.

Supraline Higher Quality			About the Same	Purity Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

3. Purity vs. Guardline.

Purity Higher Quality			About the Same	Guardline Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

4. Guardline vs. Easyride.

Guardline Higher Quality			About the Same	Easyride Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

5. Dutch Blend vs. Supraline.

Dutch Blend Higher Quality			About the Same	Supraline Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

6. Austin vs. Purity.

Austin Higher Quality			About the Same	Purity Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

7. Easyride vs. Supraline.

Easyride Higher Quality About the Same Supraline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

8. Purity vs. Dutch Blend.

Purity Higher Quality About the Same Dutch Blend Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

9. Supraline vs. Guardline.

Supraline Higher Quality About the Same Guardline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

10. Dutch Blend vs. Easyride.

Dutch Blend Higher Quality About the Same Easyride Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

11. Austin vs. Supraline.

Austin Higher Quality About the Same Supraline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

12. Guardline vs. Dutch Blend.

Guardline Higher Quality About the Same Dutch Blend Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

13. Dutch Blend vs. Austin.

Dutch Blend Higher Quality About the Same Austin Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

14. Austin vs. Guardline.

Austin Higher Quality About the Same Guardline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

15. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity Higher Quality			About the Same		Easyride Higher Quality	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE EXPERIMENTER. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!!

[Session 3]

General Instructions

The tasks you are about to perform will help us to choose a brand name for a new product. There are three parts to this session. Each involves the same list of potential names for the product. First, you will be asked to rate the familiarity of the names to you. Second, you will be asked to rate how much you like the sound and look of the names. Third you will be asked to rate the quality perception that the names inspire.

Each of the three parts will use a similar rating procedure. Brand name candidates will be compared two at a time in terms of their relative familiarity, liking, and quality perceptions. Below is an example of how to use the scale.

Suppose that you were asked to rate who you think was the better president, John F. Kennedy or Richard M. Nixon. If you think that Kennedy was far superior to Nixon, then a rating of '+3' at the far left is the best response. If you think that Kennedy was definitely better (but not by a huge margin), then a '+2' would be the most appropriate. A response of '+1" is appropriate if you think Kennedy was only slightly better than Nixon. If, on the other hand, you believe that Nixon was a vastly superior president, then you should check the '+3' at the extreme right of the scale. If you think that both presidents were equally good (or equally bad), then a '0' in the middle of the scale is the suitable response.

Kennedy Superior			About the Same		Nixon Superior	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

If you have any questions about the use of the scale or any of the instructions during this session, please ask the experimenter. He is here to help you. If you don't have any questions at this point, please proceed to part One on the following page.

Part One

Please rate each pair of names in terms of their familiarity. That is, your rating for each name pair should reflect the degree to which you've seen or heard one name more than the other. The more familiar name should read and sound more comfortable, more friendly. The brand names you will be rating are Purity, Austin, Supraline, Dutch Blend, Easyride, and Guardline.

1. Easyride vs. Austin.

Easyride More Familiar			About the Same	Austin More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. Supraline vs. Purity.

Supraline More Familiar			About the Same	Purity More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. Purity vs. Guardline.

Purity More Familiar			About the Same	Guardline More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

4. Guardline vs. Easyride.

Guardline More Familiar			About the Same	Easyride More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

5. Dutch Blend vs. Supraline.

Dutch Blend More Familiar			About the Same	Supraline More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

6. Austin vs. Purity.

Austin More Familiar			About the Same	Purity More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

7. Easyride vs. Supraline.

Easyride More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

8. Purity vs. Dutch Blend.

Purity More Familiar About the Same Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

9. Supraline vs. Guardline.

Supraline More Familiar About the Same Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

10. Dutch Blend vs. Easyride.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

11. Austin vs. Supraline.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

12. Guardline vs. Dutch Blend.

Guardline More Familiar About the Same Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

13. Dutch Blend vs. Austin.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Austin More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

14. Austin vs. Guardline.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

15. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity More Familiar			About the Same		Easyride More Familiar	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

PLEASE PROCEED TO PART TWO.

Part Two

Think about how the names look and sound. Are they pleasant or unpleasant? Which name in each pair is more pleasant, more likeable? Your rating for each brand name pair should reflect the degree to which one brand engenders a more pleasant reaction than the other.

1. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. Austin vs. Guardline.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. Dutch Blend vs. Austin.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Austin More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

4. Guardline vs. Dutch Blend.

Guardline More Familiar About the Same Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

5. Austin vs. Supraline.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

6. Dutch Blend vs. Easyride.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

7. Supraline vs. Guardline.

Supraline More Familiar About the Same Guardline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

8. Purity vs. Dutch Blend.

Purity More Familiar About the Same Dutch Blend More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

9. Easyride vs. Supraline.

Easyride More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

10. Austin vs. Purity.

Austin More Familiar About the Same Purity More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

11. Dutch Blend vs. Supraline.

Dutch Blend More Familiar About the Same Supraline More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

12. Guardline vs. Easyride.

Guardline More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

13. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity More Familiar About the Same Easyride More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

14. Supraline vs. Purity.

Supraline More Familiar About the Same Purity More Familiar

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

15. Easyride vs. Austin.

Easyride More Familiar			About the Same	Austin More Familiar		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

STOP!! DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED.

Part Three

The brand name candidates you have been rating are for a new brand of motor oil. Brand names often create perceptions of quality (or lack of quality) which can influence brand choice. Think about each of the brand names below and the impressions of quality they communicate. Compare each brand pair on the basis of the relative perception of quality (or the lack thereof) that they create.

1. Easyride vs. Austin.

Easyride Higher Quality			About the Same	Austin Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3
				+		

2. Supraline vs. Purity.

Supraline Higher Quality			About the Same	Purity Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3
				+		

3. Purity vs. Guardline.

Purity Higher Quality			About the Same	Guardline Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3
				+		

4. Guardline vs. Easyride.

Guardline Higher Quality			About the Same	Easyride Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3
				+		

5. Dutch Blend vs. Supraline.

Dutch Blend Higher Quality			About the Same	Supraline Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3
				+		

6. Austin vs. Purity.

Austin Higher Quality			About the Same	Purity Higher Quality		
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3
				+		

7. Easyride vs. Supraline.

Easyride Higher Quality About the Same Supraline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

8. Purity vs. Dutch Blend.

Purity Higher Quality About the Same Dutch Blend Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

9. Supraline vs. Guardline.

Supraline Higher Quality About the Same Guardline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

10. Dutch Blend vs. Easyride.

Dutch Blend Higher Quality About the Same Easyride Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

11. Austin vs. Supraline.

Austin Higher Quality About the Same Supraline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

12. Guardline vs. Dutch Blend.

Guardline Higher Quality About the Same Dutch Blend Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

13. Dutch Blend vs. Austin.

Dutch Blend Higher Quality About the Same Austin Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

14. Austin vs. Guardline.

Austin Higher Quality About the Same Guardline Higher Quality

+3	+2	+1	0	+1	2	+3

15. Purity vs. Easyride.

Purity Higher Quality			About the Same		Easyride Higher Quality	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE EXPERIMENTER. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!!

[Session 4]

Advertising Pretest Instructions

In a few moments you will listen to three advertisements for a new brand of motor oil. You will hear each advertisement twice. Pay very careful attention to each of the advertisement's themes and message information. After the presentation, you will be asked to evaluate the effectiveness of each of the ads along three different dimensions: How they made you feel, their credibility, and the quality of their arguments.

Please do not talk during the advertisement presentation or while you are responding to the pretest questionnaire.

STOP!! PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE SO INSTRUCTED!!

General Questionnaire Instructions

There are three different parts to this questionnaire. Each of the three parts will use a similar rating procedure. Below is an example of how to use the scales.

Suppose that you were asked to rate who you think was the better president, Jimmy Carter or Ronald Reagan.. If you think that Carter was far superior to Reagan, then a rating of '+3' at the far left is the best response. If you think that Carter was definitely better (but not by a huge margin), then a '+2' would be the most appropriate. A response of '+1" is appropriate if you think Carter was only slightly better than Reagan. If, on the other hand, you believe that Reagan was a vastly superior president, then you should check the '+3' at the extreme right of the scale. If you think that both presidents were equally good (or equally bad), then a '0' in the middle of the scale is the suitable response.

Carter Superior About the Same Reagan Superior

+3	+2	+1	0	+1 +	2	+3

If you have any questions about the use of the scale or any of the instructions during this session, please ask the experimenter. He is here to help you. If you don't have any questions at this point, please proceed to part One on the following page.

Part One

Advertising Key.

1. Ad #1 -- A. J. Foyt at the Raceway Theme
2. Ad #2 -- Pink Cadillac Theme
3. Ad #3 -- Popular Myths Must be Destroyed Theme

A. Which of the three brand ads most persuaded you that Purity motor oil extends engine life better than other brands of motor oil?

1. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "Popular Myths"

"Pink Cadillac" More Persuasive			About the Same		"Popular Myths" More Persuasive	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. "Popular Myths" vs. "A. J. Foyt"

"Popular Myths" More Feeling			About the Same		"A. J. Foyt" More Feeling	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. "A. J. Foyt" vs. "Pink Cadillac"

"A. J. Foyt" More Persuasive			About the Same		"Pink Cadillac" More Persuasive	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

B. Which of the three brand ads most effectively persuaded you that Purity improves fuel economy better than other motor oils?

1. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "Popular Myths"

"Pink Cadillac" More Persuasive			About the Same		"Popular Myths" More Persuasive	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. "Popular Myths" vs. "A. J. Foyt"

"Popular Myths" More Feeling			About the Same		"A. J. Foyt" More Feeling	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. "A. J. Foyt" vs. "Pink Cadillac"

"A. J. Foyt" More Persuasive			About the Same		"Pink Cadillac" More Persuasive	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

Part Two

Advertising Key.

1. Ad #1 -- A. J. Foyt at the Raceway Theme
2. Ad #2 -- Pink Cadillac Theme
3. Ad #3 -- Popular Myths Must be Destroyed Theme

Assume that you personally believe that motor oils differ in quality, but there is no way that motor oil can actually extend engine life or improve fuel economy. In this case, which of the three ads do you think was most persuasive?

1. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "Popular Myths"

"Pink Cadillac" More Persuasive			About the Same		"Popular Myths" More Persuasive	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. "Popular Myths" vs. "A. J. Foyt"

"Popular Myths" More Feeling			About the Same		"A. J. Foyt" More Feeling	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. "A. J. Foyt" vs. "Pink Cadillac"

"A. J. Foyt" More Persuasive			About the Same		"Pink Cadillac" More Persuasive	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

PROCEED TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Part Three

Advertising Key.

1. Ad #1 -- A. J. Foyt at the Raceway Theme
2. Ad #2 -- Pink Cadillac Theme
3. Ad #3 -- Popular Myths Must be Destroyed Theme

In your opinion, which of the brand advertisements generated the most positive, most exhilarating feelings?

1. "Pink Cadillac" vs. "Popular Myths"

"Pink Cadillac" More Feeling			About the Same		"Popular Myths" More Feeling	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

2. "Popular Myths" vs. "A. J. Foyt"

"Popular Myths" More Feeling			About the Same		"A. J. Foyt" More Feeling	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

3. "A. J. Foyt" vs. "Pink Cadillac"

"A. J. Foyt" More Feeling			About the Same		"Pink Cadillac" More Feeling	
+3	+2	+1	0	+1	+2	+3

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!!

APPENDIX D
SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES

Table 34 presents the frequency and percentage data by cell and by involvement levels for the message appeal choice dependent variable. Table 35 presents the same analysis using the brand choice dependent variable. Tables 36 and 37 present the Hypothesis One main effect analyses of advertising message involvement (AMI) and brand response involvement (BRI) using message appeal choice and brand choice, respectively. As with message appeal choice as the dependent variable, the hypothesis was supported. With one exception, all main effects were significant in the expected direction. The main effect of BRI on the optimizing appeal was in the expected direction, but not significant.

An analysis testing an alternative explanation for the main effects of AMI and BRI on message appeal choice is reported in Tables 38 and 39. It was suggested that people who formed preferences at the advertising exposure occasion would show a significant effect of AMI on message appeal choice, but no significant effect of BRI. It was also suggested that subjects that did not form preferences at the advertising exposure occasion would show no main effect of AMI, but a strong effect of BRI on message appeal choice. This explanation runs counter to the model's predictions and counter to the interpretation of the data as reported in Chapter 5 that both AMI and BRI affect each subject, AMI affecting the accessibility of advertising and BRI affecting the relevance.of advertising.

To check the validity of this explanation, the subjects that reported forming preferences, as measured in the AMI manipulation check, were separated from the subjects who did not report preference formation. Then, each data subset was analyzed. There were strong main effects of both AMI and BRI on message appeal choice among the subjects not reporting preferences. The universe of subjects who reported forming preferences was small (n=67). With one exception, main effects were not significant, but directionally, they supported main effects of both AMI and BRI. Thus, the alternative explanation was not supported.

Table 34

Message Appeal Choice

Brand Response Involvement	Advertising Message Involvement: Low			Moderate			High			Total
Low	I*:	19#	53%@	I:	13	50%	I:	9	35%	I: 41 46%
	S	10	28%	S:	7	27%	S:	9	35%	S:26 30%
	O:	7	19%	0:	6	23%	O:	8	30%	O:21 24%
Medium	I:	9	33%	I:	11	32%	I:	3	13%	I:23 27%
	S	10	37%	S:	19	56%	S:	13	54%	S:42 49%
	O:	8	30%	0:	4	12%	O:	8	33%	O:20 24%
High	I:	10	37%	I:	4	16%	I:	0	0%	I:14 16%
	S	7	26%	S:	13	52%	S:	12	36%	S:32 38%
	O:	10	37%	0:	8	32%	O:	21	64%	O:39 46%
Total	I:	38	42%	I:	28	33%	I:	12	14%	I:78 30%
	S	27	30%	S:	39	46%	S:	34	41%	S:100 39%
	O:	25	28%	0:	18	21%	O:	37	45%	O:80 31%

* "I" = Indifferent appeal; "S" = Satisficing Appeal, "O" = Optimizing Appeal

\# Raw frequency information

@ Cell percentage information

Table 35
Brand Choice

Brand Response Involvement	Advertising Message Involvement: Low	Moderate	High	Total
Low	I*: 17# 48%@ S 10 29% O: 8 23%	I: 11 42% S: 8 31% 0: 7 27%	I: 7 26% S: 9 33% O: 11 41%	I: 35 40% S:27 31% O:26 30%
Medium	I: 7 27% S 13 50% O: 6 23%	I: 11 32% S: 18 53% 0: 5 15%	I: 5 21% S: 10 42% O: 9 37%	I:23 27% S:41 49% O:20 24%
Medium	I: 12 43% S 6 21% O: 10 36%	I: 5 20% S: 16 64% 0: 4 16%	I: 1 3% S: 13 39% O: 19 58%	I:18 21% S:35 41% O:39 46%
Total	I: 36 40% S 29 33% O: 24 27%	I: 27 32% S: 42 49% 0: 16 19%	I: 13 16% S: 32 38% O: 39 46%	I:76 29% S:103 40% O:79 31%

* "I" = Indifferent appeal; "S" = Satisficing Appeal, "O" = Optimizing Appeal
\# Raw frequency information
@ Cell percentage information

Table 36
Hypothesis One Involvement Main Effect Analysis
(Message Appeal Choice)

Message Appeal	Main Effect	Involvement Level* Low**	Medium	High	Significance
Optimizing	AMI	25 [28%]	18 [21%]	37 [45%]	X =7.99, df=2, p<.018
Optimizing	BRI	21 [24%]	20 [24%]	39 [46%]	X =9.75, df=2, p<.008
Satisficing	AMI	27 [30%]	39 [46%]	34 [41%]	X =4.17, df=2, p<.125
Satisficing	BRI	26 [29%]	42 [49%]	32 [37%]	X =6.81, df=2, p<.033
Indifference	AMI	38 [42%]	28 [33%]	12 [14%]	X =10.43, df=2, p<.005
Indifference	BRI	41 [47%]	23 [27%]	14 [16%]	X =15.29, df=2, p<.001

* Raw frequency information reported first, percentage information in brackets.
** Reads: the optimizing appeal accounted for 25 of the choices when AMI was low; this represents 28% of all choices in that condition.

Table 37
Hypothesis One Involvement Main Effect Analysis
(Brand Choice)

Brand Choice	Main Effect	Involvement Level* Low**	Medium	High	Significance
Optimizing	AMI	24 [27%]	16 [19%]	39 [46%]	X =14.0, df=2, p<.003
Optimizing	BRI	26 [29%]	20 [24%]	33 [38%]	X =4.36, df=2, p<.117
Satisficing	AMI	29 [33%]	42 [49%]	32 [38%]	X =5.31, df=2, p<.075
Satisficing	BRI	27 [31%]	41 [49%]	35 [41%]	X =5.92, df=2, p<.053
Indifference	AMI	36 [40%]	27 [32%]	13 [16%]	X =13.4, df=2, p<.004
Indifference	BRI	35 [40%]	23 [27%]	18 [21%]	X =7.69, df=2, p<.024

* Raw frequency information reported first, percentage information in brackets.
** Reads: the brand with the optimizing appeal accounted for 24 of the choices when AMI was low; this represents 27% of all choices in that condition.

Table 38

(Message Appeal Choice)
(Subjects Who Did Not Report Forming Preferences at the AEO)

Message Appeal	Main Effect	Involvement Level* Low**	Medium	High	Significance
Optimizing	AMI	21 [28%]	9 [16%]	26 [44%]	X =11.03, df=2, p<.005
Optimizing	BRI	16 [24%]	13 [21%]	27 [44%]	X =9.80, df=2, p<.008
Satisficing	AMI	22 [29%]	28 [50%]	23 [39%]	X =6.04, df=2, p<.049
Satisficing	BRI	19 [28%]	31 [49%]	23 [38%]	X =5.95, df=2, p<.051
Indifference	AMI	33 [43%]	19 [34%]	10 [17%]	X =10.72, df=2, p<.005
Indifference	BRI	32 [48%]	19 [30%]	11 [18%]	X =10.70, df=2, p<.005

* Raw frequency information reported first, percentage information in brackets.
** Reads: the optimizing appeal accounted for 21 of the choices when AMI was low; this represents 28% of all choices in that condition.

Table 39
Hypothesis One Involvement Main Effect Analysis
(Message Appeal Choice)
(Subjects Who Reported Forming Preferences at the AEO)

Brand Choice	Main Effect	Involvement Level* Low**	Medium	High	Significance
Optimizing	AMI	4 [28%]	9 [31%]	11 [46%]	X =1.65, df=2, p<.448
Optimizing	BRI	5 [24%]	7 [32%]	12 [50%]	X =3.54, df=2, p<.176
Satisficing	AMI	5 [36%]	11 [38%]	11 [46%]	X = .46, df=2, p<.794
Satisficing	BRI	7 [33%]	11 [50%]	9 [38%]	X =1.36, df=2, p<.502
Indifference	AMI	5 [36%]	9 [31%]	2 [8%]	X =4.93, df=2, p<.088
Indifference	BRI	9 [43%]	4 [18%]	3 [12%]	X =6.30, df=2, p<.044

* Raw frequency information reported first, percentage information in brackets.
** Reads: the brand with the optimizing appeal accounted for 4 of the choices when AMI was low; this represents 28% of all choices in that condition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abelson, Richard.P. (1976), "Script Processing in Attitude Formation and Decision-Making." In J. S. Carroll and J.W. Payne eds., Cognition and Social Behavior (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Ajzen, I, (1985), "From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior." In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (eds.) Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior (Heidelberg: Springer, NY), 11-39.

Alba, Joseph W. and Amitava Chattopadhay (1985), "The Effects of Context and Part-Category Cues on the Recall of Competing Brands." Journal of Marketing Research 22 (August), 340-349.

Alba, Joseph W. and Lynn Hasher (1983), "Is Memory Schematic." Psychological Bulletin 93 (March), 203-231.

Alba, Joseph W. and J. Wesley Hutchinson (1987), "Dimensions of Consumer Expertise." Journal of Consumer Research 14 (March).

Alba, Joseph W. and Howard Marmorstein (1987), "The Effect of Frequency Knowledge on Consumer Decision-Making." Journal of Consumer Research 14 (June), 14-25.

Allen, Chris T. and Thomas J. Madden (1983), "Examining the Link Between Attitude Toward the Ad and Brand Attitude: A Classical Conditioning Approach." Paper presented at the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Association for Consumer Research, Chicago, IL.

Allen, Chris T. and Thomas J. Madden (1985), "A Closer Look at Classical Conditioning." Journal of Consumer Research 12 (December), 301-315.

Allport, G.W. (1935), "Attitudes." In C. Murchison ed., Handbook of Social Psychology (Clark University Press: Worchester, MA).

Anderson, John R. (1983), "A Spreading Activation Theory of Memory." Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 22 (June), 261-295.

Anderson, John and Gordon Bower (1980), Human Associative Memory (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum).

Anderson, John and Lynne Reder (1979), "An Elaborative Processing Explanation of Depth of Processing." In Laird S. Cermak and Fergus Craik ed., Levels of Processing in Human Memory (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Axelrod, Joel N.(1968) "Attitude Measures that Predict Purchase." Journal of Advertising Research 8, 3-17.

Baker, William E. (1985), "Advertising Generated Brand Evaluation: A Memory Based Information Processing Perspective." (Master's Thesis: University of Florida).

Baker, William, J. Wesley Hutchinson, Danny Moore, and Prakash Nedungadi (1986), "Brand Familiarity and Advertising: Effects on the Evoked Set and Brand Preference." In Richard J. Lutz ed., Advances in Consumer Research (Association for Consumer Research: Provo, UT), 637-42.

Baker, Willam E. and Richard J. Lutz (1987), "The Relevance-Accessibility Model of Advertising Effectiveness." In Sid Hecker and Dave W. Stewart eds., Nonverbal Communication in Advertising (Lexington Books: Lexington MA), 59-84.

Bargh, John A. (1984), "Automatic and Conscious Processing of Social Information." In R.M. Sorrentino and E.T. Higgins eds., Handbook of Cognition and Social Learning.(Guilford Press: New York, NY), 1-43.

Batra, Rajeev and Michael Ray (1985), "How Advertising Works at Contact." In Linda F. Alwitt and Andrew A. Mitchell eds., Psychological Processes and Advertising Effects: Theory, Research, and Application (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ), 13-43.

Bauer, R.A. (1967), "Consumer Behavior as Risk Taking." In D.F. Cox (ed.) Risk Taking and Information Handling in Consumer Behavior (Harvard University Press: Boston, MA),

Becknell, J.C., W.R. Wilson, and J.C. Baird (1963), "The Effect of frequency of presentation on the choice of nonsense syllables," Journal of Psychology 56, 165-170.

Belch, George E., "The Effects of Television Commercial Repetition on Cognitive Response and Message Acceptance (1982)." Journal of Consumer Research 9 (June), 56-65.

Bem, D.J. (1972), "Self-Perception Theory." In L. Berkowitz ed., Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 6, (Academic Press: New York, NY).

Berger, Ida E. and Andrew A. Mitchell (1989), "The Effect of Advertising on Attitude Accessibility, Attitude Confidence, and the Attitude-Behavior Relationship." Journal of Consumer Research 16 (December), 269-279.

Berlyne. D. E.(1970), "Novelty, Complexity, and Hedonic Value." Perception & Psychophysics 8, 279-285.

Bettman, James R. (1979), An Information Processing Theory of Consumer Choice (Addison-Wesley: Reading MA).

Bettman, James R., Noel Capon and Richard J. Lutz (1975), "Cognitive Algebra in Multi-Attribute Attitude Models." Journal of Marketing Research 12 (May), 357-374.

Bettman, James R. and Michael A. Zins (1977), "Constructive Processes in Consumer Choice." Journal of Consumer Research 4 (September), 75-87.

Biehal, Gabriel and Dipankar Chakravarti (1983), "Information Accessibility as a Moderator of Consumer Choice." Journal of Consumer Research 10 (June), 1-14.

Biehal, Gabriel and Dipankar Chakravarti (1986), "Consumers Use of Memory and External Information on Choice: Macro and Micro Perspectives." Journal of Consumer Research 12 (March), 383-405.

Bierley, Calvin, Frances K. McSweeney and Renee Vannieuwkerk (1985), "Classical Conditioning of Preferences for Stimuli." Journal of Consumer Research 12 (December), 316-323.

Birnbaum, Michael H. and Barbara A. Mellers (1979), "Stimulus Recognition May Mediate Exposure Effects." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37, 391-394.

Bloch, P.H. and M.L. Richins (1983), "A Theoretical Model for the Study of Product Importance Perceptions." Journal of Marketing 47, Summer, 69-81.

Bolles, R.C. (1972), "Reinforcement, Expectancy, and Learning." Psychological Review 79, 304-409.

Borgida, E. and R. E. Nisbett (1977), "The Differential Impact of Abstract Vs. Concrete Information on Decisions." Journal of Applied Social Psychology 1, 258-271.

Bowen, Lawrence and Steven W. Chaffee (1974), "Product Involvement and Pertinent Advertising Appeals." Journalism Quarterly 51, 613-624.

Bower, Gordon H. (1970), "Imagery as a Relational Organizer in Associative Learning." Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 9, 529-537.

Bower, Gordon H.(1981), "Mood and Memory."..American Psychologist 36, 129-148.

Brewer, William F. (1974), "There is No Convincing Evidence for Operant or Classical Conditioning in Adult Humans." In W. Weimer and D. Palmero eds., Cognition and the Symbolic Processes (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Brock, Timothy C. and Stuart M. Albert (1970), "Familiarity, Utility, and Supportiveness as Determinants of Information Receptivity." Journal of Personality and Social Pyschology 14, (4), 292-301.

Buchwald, Alexander M.(1976), "Learning Theory and Behavior Therapy", in Vol. 3, W.K. Estes ed., Handbook of Learning and Cognitive Processes (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, NJ).

Burgess, Thomas D. G. and Stephen M. Sales (1971), "Attitudinal Effects of 'Mere Exposure': A Reevaluation." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 7, 461-472.

Burke, Raymond R. and Thomas K. Srull (1988), "Competitive Interference and Consumer Memory for Advertising." Journal of Consumer Research 15 (June), 55-68.

Burnkrant, Robert E. and Alan G. Sawyer (1983), "Effects of Involvement and Message Content on Information Processing Intensity." in Richard J. Harris ed., Information Processing Research in Advertising (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ)

Cacioppo, John T. and Richard E. Petty (1979), "Effects of Message Repetition and Position on Cognitive Response, Recall, and Persuasion." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37, 97-109.

Campbell, B.G. (1974), Human Evolution (Aldine: Chicago, IL).

Carlston, D.(1980), "Recall and Use of Observed Behavioral Episodes and Inferred Traits in Social Inference Processes." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 16, 779-804.

Celsi, Richard L. and Jerry C. Olson (1989), "The Role of Involvement in Attention and Comprehension Processes." Journal of Consumer Research 15 (September), 210-224.

Chaiken, Shelly (1980), "Heuristic Versus Systematic Information Processing and the Use of Source Versus Message Cues in Persuasion." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 39 (November), 752-766.

Chaiken, Shelly and Alice H. Eagley (1976), "Communication Modality as a Determinant of Persuasion: The Role of Communicator Salience." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 45 (2), 241-256.

Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Joseph W. Alba (1988), "The Situational Importance of Recall and Inference in Consumer Decision-Making." Journal of Consumer Research 15 (June), 1-12.

Clark, Margaret S. (1982), "A Role for Arousal in the Link Between Feeling States, Judgements and Behavior." In M.S. Clark and S.T. Fiske Eds., Affect and Cognition (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Clark, Margaret S., and Alice M. Isen (1982), "Toward Understanding the Relationship between Feeling States and Social Behavior." In A.H. Hastorf and A.M. Isen eds., Cognitive Social Psychology (Elsevier North Holland; New York), 73-108.

Cohen B. (1964), "Role of Awareness in Meaning Established by Classical Conditioning." Journal of Experimental Psychology 67, 373-378.

Cohen Joel B.(1982), "Involvement: Separating the State from Its Causes and Effects," Working Paper #33, University of Florida.

Cohen, Joel B. (1987), "Attitude, Affect and Consumer Behavior." In Alice M. Isen and Bert S. Moore eds., Affect and Social Behavior (Cambridge University Press: New York, NY).

Cook, T.D. and Flay R.R. (1978), "The Persistence of Experimentally Induced Attitude Change." In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 11 (Academic Press: New York, NY), 1-57.

Cox, D.F. (1967), "Risk Handling in Consumer Behavior - An Intensive Study of Two Cases." In: D.F. Cox (ed.), Risk - Taking and Information Handling in Consumer Behavior (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA), 34-81.

Crowder, Robert G. (1976),.Principles of Learning and Memory (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Dichter, Ernest (1960), The Strategy of Desire (Doubleday: New York, NY).

Doob, L.W. (1947), "The Behavior of Attitudes." Psychological Review 54, 135-156.

Dreben, E., S. Fiske, and R. Hastie (1979), " The Independence of Item and Evaluation Information." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37, 1758-1768.

Dutta, S. and R.N. Kanungo (1972), "Retention of Affective Material: Effects of Intensity of Affect on Retrieval." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 23, 64-80.

Eysenck, M.W. (1977), Human Memory: Theory, Research, and Individual Differences (Pergamon: Oxford).

Fazio, Russell H. (1986), "How Do Attitudes Guide Behavior." In Richard M. Sorrentino and E. Tory Higgins eds., Handbook of Motivation and Cognition (Guilford Press: New York, NY), 204-243.

Fazio, Russell H., Jeaw-Mei Chen, Elizabeth C. McDonel and Steven J. Sherman (1982), "Attitude Accessibility, Attitude-Behavior Consistency, and the Strength of Object-Evaluation Association." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 18 (July), 339-357.

Fazio, Russell H., Martha C. Powell and Paul M. Herr (1983), "Toward a Process Model of the Attitude-Behavior Relation: Accessing One's Attitude Upon Mere Observation of the Attitude Object." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 44 (April), 723-735.

Fazio, Russell H., Martha C. Powell and Carol J. Williams (1989), "The Role of Attitude Accessibility in the Attitude-to-Behavior Process." Journal of Consumer Research, 16 (December), 280-288.

Fazio, Russell H. and Mark P. Zanna (1979), "Direct Experience and Attitude-Behavior Consistency." Advances in Experimental Social Psychlology.

Feldman, Jack M. and John G. Lynch, Jr. (1988), "Self-Generated Validity and Other Effects of Measurement on Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior." Journal of Applied Psychology 73 (August), 421-535.

Fishbein, Martin A. (1963), "An Investigation of the Relationships Between Beliefs About an Object and the Attitude Toward that Object." Human Relations 16, 233-239.

Fishbein, Martin A. (1967), "Attitude and the Prediction of Behavior." In Martin Fishbein ed., Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement (Wiley: New York, NY), 477-492.

Fishbein, Martin and Icek Ajzen (1975), Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company: Reading, MA).

Fiske, Susan (1982), "Schema-Triggered Affect: Applications to Social Perception." In M.S. Clark and S.T. Fiske eds., Affect and Cognition (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Gardner, David (1971), "Is There a Generalized Price-Quality Relationship?" Journal of Marketing Research 8, 241-243.

Gardner, Meryl.Paul. (1985), "Does Attitude Toward the Ad Affect Brand Attitude Under a Brand Evaluation Set?" Journal of Marketing Research 22, 192-198.

Gardner, Meryl Paul, Andrew A. Mitchell and J. Edward Russo (1985), "Low Involvement Strategies for Processing Advertising." Journal of Advertising 14, 4-12.

Glass, L. A., Holyoak, K. J. and John Lester Santa (1973), Cognition. (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company: Reading, MA).

Gorn, Gerald, J.(1982), "The Effects of Music in Advertising on Choice Behavior: A Classical Conditioning Approach." Journal of Marketing, 94-101.

Greenwald, Anthony G. (1968), "Cognitive Learning, Cognitive Responses to Persuasion and Attitude Change." In Anthony G. Greenwald ed., Psychological Foundations of Attitudes (Academic Press: New York, NY), 147-170.

Greenwald, Anthony.G. and Clark Leavitt (1984), "Audience Involvement in Advertising, Four Levels." Journal of Consumer Research 9 (December), 132-140.

Gresham, Larry G. and Terence A. Shimp (1985), "Attitude Toward the Advertisement and Brand Attitudes: A Classical Conditioning Perspective." Journal of Advertising 14, 10-17.

Haley, Russell I. and Peter B. Case (1979), "Testing Thirteen Attitude Scales for Agreement and Brand Discrimination." Journal of Marketing 43 (Fall), 20-32.

Harrison, Albert A., "Mere Exposure.(1977)", In Leonard Berkowitz ed., Advances in Experimenal Social Psychology (Academic Press: New York, New York).

Hasher, Lynn and Rose T. Zacks (1979), "Automatic and Effortful Processes in Memory." Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 108 (3), 356-388.

Haskins, J. B.(1964), "Factual Recall as a Measure of Advertising Effectiveness." Journal of Advertising Research 4 (March), 39-45.

Hirschman, Elizabeth C. and Morris B. Holbrook (1982), "Hedonic Consumption: Emerging Concepts, Methods, and Propositions." Journal of Marketing 46 (Summer), 92-101.

Hoch, Stephen J. (1984), "Availability and Interference in Predictive Judgement." Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition 10 (October), 649-662.

Holbrook, Morris B., "Beyond Attitude Structure: Toward the Informational Determinants of Attitude." Journal of Marketing Research 15 (November), 545-556.

Holbrook, Morris B. and Donald R. Lehmann (1980), "Form versus Content in Predicting Starch Scores." Journal of Advertising Research 20, 53-62.

Hovland, C. I. and W. Weiss (1951), "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness." Public Opinion Quarterly 15, 635-650.

Hoyer, Wayne D. (1984), "An Examination of Consumer Decision-Making for a Common Repeat Purchase Product." Journal of Consumer Research 11 (December), 822-829.

Hugstad, P.S. and J.W. Taylor (1979), "Risk Theory and the Science of Marketing." In O.C. Ferrell, S.W. Brown and C.W. Lamb eds., Conceptual and Theoretical Developments in Marketing (American Marketing Association: Chicago, IL), 448-457.

Insko, Chester A. and William F. Oakes (1966), "Awareness and the Conditioning of Attitudes." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 4 (November), 487-496.

Isen, Alice M. (1984), "Affect, Cognition, and Social Behaviour." In R.S. Wyer and T.K. Srull eds., Handbook of Social Cognition, Vol. 3 (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, NJ).

Isen, Alice M., Thomas Shalker, Margaret Clark, and Lynn Karp (1978), "Affect, Accessibility of Material in Memory, and Behavior: A Cognitive Loop?", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 36, 1-13.

Jacoby, Jacob and Wayne D. Hoyer (1989), "The Comprehension/Miscomprehension of Print Communication: Selected Findings." Journal of Consumer Research 15 (March), 434-443.

Janiszewski, Chris (1988), "Preconscious Processing Effects: The Independence of Attitude Formation and Conscious Thought." Journal of Consumer Research 15 (September), 199-209.

Janiszewski, Chris (1990), "The Influence of Print advertisement Organization on Affect Toward a Brand Name." Journal of Consumer Research 17 (June), 53-65.

Johnson, Eric J. and Jay E. Russo (1984), "Product Familiarity and Learning New Information." Journal of Consumer Research 11, 542-550.

Johnson, Homer H. and Thomas A. Watkins (1971), "The Effects of Message Repetition on Immediate and Delayed Attitude Change." Psychonomic Science 22, 101-103.

Kamin, Leon J. and Charles J. Brimer (1969), "The Effects of Intensity of Conditioned and Unconditioned Stimuli on a Conditioned Emotional Response." Canadian Journal of Psychology 17 (2), 194-200.

Kapferer, Jean-Noel and Gilles Laurent (1985), "Consumer Involvement Profiles: A New Practical Approach to Consumer Involvement." Journal of Advertising Research 25 (December), 48-55.

Kaplan, S. (1976), "Adaptation, Structure and Knowledge." In G.T. Moore and R.G. Golledge eds., Environmental Knowing (Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross: Stroudsberg, PA).

Kassarjian, Harold H.(1977), "Presidential Address, 1977: Anthropomorphism and Parsimony." In Keith Hunt ed., Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 5, (Association for Consumer Research: Ann Arbor, MI), xii-xiv.

Katz, D. (1960), "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly 24, 163-204.

Keller, Kevin Lane (1987), "Memory Factors in Advertising: The Effect of Advertising Retrieval Cues on Brand Evaluation." Journal of Consumer Research 14 (December), 316-333.

Keller, Kevin Lane (1990), "Memory Retrieval Factors and Advertising Effectiveness." In Andrew A. Mitchell ed., Advertising Exposure, Memory and Choice (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Kisielius, Jolita and Brian Sternthal (1984), "Examining the Vividness Controversy: An Availability-Valence Interpretation." Journal of Consumer Research 12, March, 418-431.

Kraft, Frederic B., Granbois, Donald H. and John O. Summers (1973), "Brand Evaluation and Brand Choice: A Longitudinal Study." Journal of Marketing Research 10 (August), 235-41.

Kroeber-Riel, Werner (1984), "Emotional Product Differentiation By Classical Conditioning." In Morris E. Holbrook and Barbara Hirschman, eds, Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 11 (Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research), 538-543.

Krugman, Herbert E.(1965), "The Impact of Television Advertising: Learning without Involvement." Public Opinion Quarterly 29, 349-356.

Krugman, Herbert E.(1967), "The Measuring of Advertising Involvement." Public Opinion Quarterly 30, 583-96.

Krugman, Herbert E.(1972), "Why Three Exposures May Be Enough." Journal of Advertising Research 12 (December), 11-14.

Krugman, Herbert. E.(1977), "Memory Without Recall, Exposure Without Perception." Journal of Advertising Research 17 (August), 7-12.

Krugman, Herbert E. and Eugene L. Hartley (1971), "Passive Learning from Television." Public Opinion Quarterly 34, 184-190.

Kunst-Wilson, W. and R. Zajonc (1980), "Affective Discrimination of Stimuli that Cannot Be Recognized." Science 207, 557-588.

Langer, Ellen J.(1989), "Minding Matters: The Consequences of Mindlessness-Mindfullness." In Leonard Berkowitz ed., Advances in Experimental Psychology (Academic Press: New York, NY) 22, 137-173.

Lastovicka, John L. and E. H. Bonfield (1982), "Do Consumers Have Brand Attitudes?" Journal of Economics Psychology 2, 57-75.

Lavidge, R.J. and G.A. Steiner (1961), "A Model of Predictive Measurement of Advertising Effectiveness." Journal of Marketing 25, 59-62.

Lichtenstein, M. and T. Srull (1985), "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Examining the Relationship Between Consumer Memory and Judgement." In Linda F. Alwitt and Andrew A. Mitchell eds., Psychological Processes and Advertising Effects: Theory Research and Application (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Lingle, J., and T. Ostrom (1979), "Retrieval Selectivity in Memory-Based Impression Judgements." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37 , 180-194.

Lingle. J., and T. Ostrom (1981), "Principles of Memory and Cognition in Attitude Formation." In Petty et al. Eds., Cognitive Responses in Persuasion (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Logan, G.D. (1980), "Attention and Automaticity in Stroop and Priming Tasks: Theory and Data." Cognitive Psychology 12, 523-553.

Loken, Barbara and Ronald Hoverstad (1985), "Relationships Between Information Recall and Subsequent Attitudes: Some Exploratory Findings." Journal of Consumer Research 12 (September), 155-168.

Lutz, Richard J. (1975), "Changing Brand Attitudes Through Modification of Cognitive Structure." Journal of Consumer Research 1 (March), 49-57.

Lutz, Richard J.(1977), "An Experimental Investigation of Causal Relations Among Cognitions, Affect, and Behavioral Intention." Journal of Consumer Research 3 (March), 97-207.

Lutz, Richard J.(1985), "Affective and Cognitive Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad: A Conceptual Framework." In Linda F. Alwitt and Andrew A. Mitchell, eds., Psychological Processes and Advertising Effects: Theory, Research, and Application (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Lutz, Richard J., Scott B. MacKenzie and George E. Belch (1982), "Attitude Toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness: Determinants and Consequences." In R. P. Bagozzi and A. M. Tybout eds., Vol, 10, Advances in Consumer Research (Association for Consumer Research: Ann Arbor. MI), 532-539.

Lutz, Richard J. and John L. Swasy (1977), "Integrating Cognitive Structure and Cognitive Response Approaches to Monitoring Communication Effects." In William D. Perrault ed., Vol. 4, Advances in Consumer Research (Association for Consumer Research: Atlanta, GA), 363-371.

Lynch, J.G. and Thomas K. Srull (1982), "Memory and Attentional Factors in Consumer Choice: Concepts and Research Methods." Journal of Consumer Research 9, 18-37.

MacKenzie, Scott B. and Richard J. Lutz (1989), "An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Pretesting Context." Journal of Marketing 53 (April), 48-65.

MacKenzie, Scott B., Richard J. Lutz and George E. Belch (1986), "The Role of Attitude Toward the Ad as a Mediator of Advertising Effectiveness: A Test of Competing Explanations." Journal of Marketing Research 23 (May), 130-143.

Mandler, George (1982), "The Structure of Value: Accounting for Taste. In M.S. Clarke and S.T. Fiske eds., Affect and Cognition: The 17th Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Mandler, George (1984), Mind and Body: Psychology of Emotion and Stress (W.W. Norton Co: New York, NY).

McQuire, William (1978), "An Information Processing Model of Advertising Effectiveness." In H.L. Davis and A.J. Silk Eds., Behavioral and Management Science in Marketing (Ronald Press: New York, NY).

McSweeney, Francis K. and Calvin Bierley (1984), "Recent Developments in Classical Conditioning." Journal of Consumer Research 11 (September), 619-631.

Milliman, Ronald E. (1982), "Using Background Music to Affect Shoppers Behavior." Journal of Marketing 46, 86-91.

Milliman, Ronald E. (1986), "The Influence of Background Music on the Behavior of Restaurant Patrons." Journal of Consumer Research 13, 286-289.

Mitchell, Andrew A. (1979), "Involvement: A Potentially Important Mediator of Consumer Behavior." In William L. Wilkie ed., Advances in Consumer Research (Association for Consumer Research: Ann Arbor, MI) 6, 191-195.

Mitchell, Andrew A. (1981), "The Dimensions of Advertising Involvement." In Kent Monroe ed., Advances in Consumer Research (Association for Consumer Research: Ann Arbor, MI) 8, 25-30.

Mitchell, Andrew A. and Jerry C. Olson (1981), "Are Product Attribute beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude." Journal of Marketing Research 17 (August), 318-32.

Monroe, Kent (1973), "Buyers' Subjective Perception of Price." Journal of Marketing Research 10, 70-80.

Moore, Danny L. and J. Wesley Hutchinson (1983), "The Effects of Ad Affect on Advertising Effectiveness." In R.P. Bagozzi and A.M. Tybout, eds. Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 10 (Association for Consumer Research: Ann Arbor, MI), 526-31.

Moore, Danny L. and J. Wesley Hutchinson (1985), "The Influence of Affective Reactions to Advertising: Direct and Indirect Mechanisms of Attitude Change." In Linda F. Alwitt and Andrew A. Mitchell, eds. Psychological Processes and Advertising Research, 526-31.

Moreland, Richard L. and Robert B. Zajonc (1977), "Is Stimulus Recognition a Necessary Condition for the Occurence of Exposure Effects?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 35, 191-199.

Neisser, Ulric (1981), "John Dean's Memory, A Case Study." Cognition 9 (February), 1-22.

Nisbett, R. and L. Ross (1980), Human Inference: Strategies and Shortcomings of Social Judgement (Prentice Hall Inc: Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Nord, Walter R. and J. Paul Peter (1980), "A Behavior Modification Perspective on Marketing." Journal of Marketing 44 (Spring), 36-47.

Olshavsky, Richard W. and Donald H. Granbois (1979), "Consumer Decision-Making--Fact or Fiction?", Journal of Consumer Research 6, 93-100.

Osterhouse, Robert A. and Timothy C. Brock ((1970), "Distraction Increases Yielding to Propaganda by Inhibiting Counterarguing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 15, 344-358.

Page, Monte M. (1969), "Social Psychology of a Classical Conditioning of Attitudes Experiment." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 11 (February), 177-186.

Park, C.W. and S. Mark Young (1986), "Consumer Response to Television Commercials: The Impact of Involvement and Background Music on Brand Attitude Formation." Journal of Marketing Research 23 (February), 11-22.

Pavlov, Ivan P. (1927), Conditioned Reflexes (Oxford University Press: Oxford, England).

Pechman, Cornelia and David W. Stewart (1990), "The Effects of Comparative Advertising on Attention, Memory, and Purchase Intentions." Journal of Consumer Research 17 (September), 180-191.

Peter, J. Paul and Walter R. Nord (1982), "A Clarification and Extension of Operant Conditioning Principles in Marketing." Journal of Marketing 46, 102-107.

Petty, Richard E. and John T. Cacioppo (1979), "Issue Involvement Can Increase or Decrease Persuasion by Enhancing Message-Relevant Cognitive Responses." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37, 1915-1926.

Petty, Richard E. and John T.Cacioppo (1981), Attitudes and Persuasion: Classic and Contemporary Approaches. (Wm. C. Brown Co: Dubuque, IA).

Petty, Richard E. and John T. Cacioppo (1984), "Source Factors and the Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion." In Thomas C. Kinnear (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research (Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research) 11, 668-672.

Petty, Richard E., John T. Cacioppo and D. Schumann (1983), "Central and Peripheral Routes to Advertising Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Involvement." Journal of Consumer Research 10 pgs. 135-46.

Posner, M.I. and C.R. Snyder (1975), "Attention and Cognitive Control," in R.L. Solso ed., Information Processing and Cognition: The Loyola Symposium (Lawrence Erlabaum: Hillsdale, N.J).

Osterhous, R.A. and Timothy C. Brock (1970), "Distraction Increases Yielding to Propaganda by Inhibiting Counterarguing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 15. 344-358.

Ray, Michael L. and Rageev Batra (1982), "Advertising Situations: The Implications of Differential Involvement and Accompanying Affect Responses." In Richard J. Harris ed., Information Processing Research in Advertising (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, N.J).

Ray, Michael L. and Alan G. Sawyer (1971), "Repetition in Media Models: A Laboratory Technique." Journal of Marketing Research 8 (February), 20-29.

Ray, Michael L, Alan G. Sawyer, Michael L. Rothschild, M. Roger, and J.B. Reed (1973), "Marketing Communications and the Hierarchy of Effects," In New Models for Mass Communication Research (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage).

Razran, G (1971), Mind in Evolution (Houghton-Mifflin: Boston, MA).

Reiss, S. (1980), "Pavlovian Conditioning and Human Fear: An Expectancy Model." Behavior Therapy 11, 380-396.

Rescorla, Robert A. (1967), "Pavlovian Conditioning and its Proper Control Procedures." Psychological Review 74 (1), 71-80.

Resnick, Alan and Bruce L. Stern (1977), "An Analysis of Information Content in Television Advertising." Journal of Marketing 41 (January), 50-3.

Reyes, Robert M., William C. Thompson, and Gordon H. Bower (1980), "Judgmental Biases Resulting from Differing Availabilities of Arguments." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 39, 2-12.

Reynolds, Thomas J. and Jonathan Gutman (1988), "Laddering Theory, Method, Analysis and Interpretation." Journal of Advertising Research 28 (February), 11-31.

Robertson, Thomas S., "Low Committment Consumer Behavior.(1976)" Journal of Advertising Research 16,19-24.

Roediger, Henry L. and James H. Neely (1982), "Retrieval Blocks in Episodic and Semantic Memory," Canadian Journal of Psychology 36 (June), 213-42.

Rosenberg, M.J. (1956), "Cognitive Structure and Attitudinal Affect." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 53, 367-372.

Ross, Harold L. Jr., "Recall Versus Persuasion: An Answer.(1980)" Journal of Advertising Research 22, 13-18.

Ross, I (1975), "Perceived Risk and Consumer Behavior: A Critical Review." In M.L. Schlinger (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, (Chicago, IL: Association for Consumer Research) 2, 1-19.

Rossiter, John R. and Larry Percy (1980), "Attitude Change Through Visual Imagery." Journal of Advertising 9 (2), 10-16.

Rothschild, M.L. (1984), "Perspectives on Involvement: Current Problems and Future Directions." In T.C. Kinner ed., Advances in Consumer Research (Ann Arbor MI: Association for Consumer Research).

Rothschild, M.L. and Michael L. Ray (1974), "Involvement and Political Advertising Effect: An Exploratory Experiment." Communication Research 2, 18-27.

Ryan, Michael and E.H. Bonfield (1975), "The Fishbein Extended Model of Consumer Behavior." Journal of Consumer Research 2 (September), 118-136.

Sawyer, Alan G.(1973), "The Effects of Repetition of Refutational and Supportive Advertising Appeals." Journal of Marketing Research 10 (February), 23-33.

Sawyer, Alan G. and Scott Ward (1979), "Carry-Over Effects in Advertising Communication." Research in Marketing 2, 259-314.

Schick, Connie, Richard P. McGlynn, and Dennis Worlam (1972), "Perception of Cartoon Humor as a Function of Familiarity and Anxiety Level." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 24 (1), 22-25.

Schlinger, Mary Jane (1979), "A Profile of Responses to Commercials." Journal of Advertising Research 19 (November), 37-46.

Schneider, W. and R. M. Shiffrin (1977), "Controlled and Automatic Human Information Processing: I. Detection, Search and Attention." Psychological Review 84, 1-66.

Sherif, M. and Carl Hovland (1961), Social Judgement (Yale University Press: New Haven, CT).

Sherif, C.W., M. Sherif and R.E. Nebergall (1965), Attitude and Attitude Change (Saunders: Philadelphia).

Sheth, Jagdish M. and M. Venkatesan (1968), "Risk Reduction Processes in Repetitive Consumer Behavior." Journal of Marketing Research 5, 307-310.

Shiffrin, R.M. and W. Schneider (1977), "Controlled and Automatic Human Information Processing: II. Perceptual Learning, Automatic Attending, and a General Theory." Psychological Review 84, 127-190.

Shimp, Terence A.(1981), "Attitude Toward the Ad as a Mediator of Consumer Brand Choice." Journal of Advertising 10, 9-15.

Silk, Alvin J. and Terry G. Vavra (1974), "The Influence of Advertising's Affective Qualities on Consumer Response." In D. Hughes and M. L. Ray (eds.), Buyer/Consumer Information Processing. (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, NC), 157-186.

Skinner, B.F. (!972), Beyond Freedom and Dignity (Alfred A. Knopf: New York, NY).

Smith, Robert E. and William R. Swinyard (1982), "Information Response Models: An Integrated Approach." Journal of Marketing 46 (Winter) 81-93.

Smith, Robert E. and William R. Swinyard (1983), "Attitude-Behavior Consistency: The Impact of Product Trial Versus Advertising." Journal of Marketing Research 20, 257-267.

Snyder, Mark. and William Swann (1976), "When Actions Reflect Attitudes: The Politics of Impression Management." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 34, 1034-1042.

Srull, Thomas K. (1981), "Person Memory: Some Tests of Associative Storage and Retrieval Models." Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory 7(6), 440-463.

Srull, Thomas.K. (1983), "Affect and Memory: The Impact of Affective Reactions in Advertising on the Representations of Product Information in Memory." In R.P. Bagozzi and A.M. Tybout eds., Advances in Consumer Research 10 (Association for Consumer Research: Ann Arbor, MI), 520-525.

Staats, Arthur W.(1969), "Experimental Demand Characteristics and the Classical Conditioning of Attitudes." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 11 (2), 187-192.

Staats, Arthur.W. (1981), "Paradigmatic Behaviorism, Unified Theory Construction Methods and the Zeitgist of Separatism." American Psychologist 36 (March), 239-56.

Staats, Carolyn K. and Arthur W. Staats (1957), "Meaning Established by Classical Conditioning." Journal of Experimental Psychology 54, 74-80.

Staats, Carolyn K. and Arthur W. Staats (1958), "Attitudes Established by Classical Conditioning." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 57, 37-40.

Stang, David J.(1974), "Methodological Factors in Mere Exposure." Psychological Bulletin 81, 1014-1024.

Stang, David J.(1975), "Effects of 'Mere Exposure' on Learning and Affect." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 31, 7-12.

Sternthal, Brian, Dholakia, Ruby and Clark Leavitt (1978), "The Persuasive Effect of Source Credibility: Tests of Cognitive Response." Journal of Consumer Research 4 (March), 252-260.

Taylor, Shelly E. and Susan T. Fiske. (1978), "Salience, Attention, and Attribution: Top of Head Phonomena." In L. Berkowitz ed., Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Academic Press: New York) 11.

Taylor, Shelly E. and Suzanne C. Thompson (1982), "Stalking the Elusive 'Vividness' Effect." Psychological Review 89 (March), 155-81.

Tesser, Abraham and Mary Charles Conlee (1975), "Some Effects of Time and Thought on Attitude Polarization." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 31, 262-270.

Thorson, Esther and Marian Friestad (1986), "The Effects of Emotion on Episodic Memory for TV Commercials." In Alice Tybout and Pat Cafferata eds., Advertising and Consumer Psychology (Lexington Press: New York, NY).

Toy, Daniel R (1982). "Monitoring Communication Effects: A Cognitive Structure/Cognitive Response Approach." Journal of Consumer Research 9 (June), 66-76.

Traylor, Mark B. (1981), "Product Involvement and Brand Committment." Journal of Advertising Research 21, June, 27-33

Traylor, Mark B. (1985), "Ego Involvement and Brand Committment: Not Necessarily the Same." Journal of Consumer Marketing 1, 14-19.

Tulving, E. and D.M. Thompson (1973), "Encoding Specificity and Retrieval Processes in Episodic Memory." Journal of Experimental Psychology 80, 352-373.

Tversky, S. and S. Thompson (1973), "Availability: A Heuristic for Judging Frequency and Probability." Cognitive Psychology 5, 207-232.

Watts, W.A. (1967), "Relative Persistence of Attitude Change Induced by Active Compared to Passive Participation." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.71, 142-149.

Watts, W.A. and W.J. McGuire (1964), "Persistence of Induced Opinion Change and Retention of Inducing Message Content." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68, 233-241.

Wells, William D., Leavitt, Clark and Maureen McConville (1971), "A Reaction Profile for TV Commercials." Journal of Advertising Research 11 (December), 11-17.

Wheatley, John J., Richard G. Walton and John S.Y. Chiu (1982), "The Influence of Prior Product Experience, Price, and Brand Name on Quality Perception." In W. Perrault ed., Advances in Consumer Research (Association for Consumer Research: Ann Arbor, MI) 4, 72-77.

Wicker, Allan W. (1969), "Attitudes Versus Actions: The Relationship of Verbal and Overt Behavior Response to Attitude Objects." Journal of Social Issues 25 (4), 41-78.

Wilkie, William and Edgar A. Pessimier (1973), "Issues in Marketing's Use of Multi-Attribute Attitude Models." Journal of Marketing Research 10 (November), 428-41.

Wright, Peter, L. (1973), "Cognitive Processes Mediating Acceptance of Advertising." Journal of Marketing Research 10 (February), 52-62.

Wright, Peter L. (1974), "The Harassed Decision Maker: Time Pressures, Distractions, and the Use of Evidence." Journal of Applied Psychology 59, 555-561.

Wright, Peter L. (1980), "Message-Evoked Thoughts: Persuasion Research Using Thought Verbalizations." Journal of Consumer Research 7 (September), 151-175.

Wright, Peter and Peter Rip (1980), "Product Class Advertising Effects on First Time Buyers' Decision Strategies." Journal of Consumer Research 7 (September), 176-188.

Wyer Robert S., Jr. and Thomas Srull (1980), "The Proceesing of Social Stimulus Information: A Conceptual Integration." In R. Hastie, T. Ostrom, E. Ebbesen, R. Wyer, D. Hamilton, and D. Carlson Eds., Person Memory: The Cognitive Basis of Social Perception (Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ).

Wyer, Robert S., Jr. and Thomas Srull (1986), "Human Cognition in its Social Context." Psychological Review 93 (July) 322-359.

Zajonc, R. B.(1968), "Attitudinal Effects of Mere Exposure." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement 9 (June), part 2.

Zajonc, Robert B.(1980), "Feeling and Thinking Preferences Need No Inferences." American Psychologist 35 (February), 151-175.

Zajonc, Robert. B., Rick Crandall and Robert V. Kail Jr.(1974), "Effect of Extreme Exposure Frequencies on Different Affective Ratings on Stimuli." Perceptual and Motor Skills 38, 667-668.

Zajonc, Robert B. and Hazel Markus (1982), "Affective and Cognitive Factors in Preferences." Journal of Consumer Research 9 (September), 123-131.

Zajonc, Robert. B., Hazel Markus and William Raft Wilson (1974), "Exposure Effects and Associative Learning." Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology 10, 248-263.

Zajonc, Robert. B. and D. W. Rajecki (1969), "Exposure and Affect: A Field Experiment." Psychonomic Science 17, 216-17.

Zanna, Mark P., Charles A. Kiesler and Paul A. Pilkonis (1970), "Positive and Negative Attitudinal Affect Establsihed by Classical Conditioning." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 14, 321-328.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

William Edward Baker was born in Chicago in 1955. After completing high school in Boston, he attended Northwestern University and received a B.A. degree in psychology in 1977. Through 1980, he pursued a career in advertising in Chicago, first with Montgomery Ward, Inc. and then with McKinney MidAmerica. In the fall of 1981, he left Chicago to pursue a M.A. degree in marketing at the University of Florida. In the spring of 1984, he entered the marketing doctoral program at the University of Florida. In 1987, Mr. Baker left Gainesville to become the Director of Marketing Services at Ericson Marketing Communications in Nashville, Tennessee. In the spring of 1991, he was promoted to Vice President of Marketing, the position he currently holds.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Richard J. Lutz, Chairman
Professor of Marketing

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Alan G. Sawyer
Professor of Marketing

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

J. Wesley Hutchinson
Associate Professor of Marketing

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to the acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

David T. Brown
Assistant Professor of Finance,
Insurance and Real Estate

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Marketing in the College of Business Administration and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August, 1991

Dean, Graduate School

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 08553 7552